

NEW EDITION

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

*The Secret Diary of an
English Servant Among the Ottomans*

NIGEL AND CAROLINE WEBB

'A goldmine for anyone interested in the Ottoman Empire'

Philip Mansel



I.B. TAURIS

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

Caroline Webb graduated in History from the University of London and read Italian and Art History in Cambridge and Verona. She has worked as a historical researcher and teacher.

Nigel Webb is the author and series editor of numerous educational books. He studied at the University of Cambridge and has worked as a teacher, both in the UK and in Tanzania. He is a direct descendant of Samuel Medley, whose diary was one of the inspirations for this book.

The Earl and His Butler in Constantinople

*The Secret Diary of an English
Servant among the Ottomans*

Nigel and Caroline Webb

I.B. TAURIS

LONDON · NEW YORK

Published in 2009 by I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd
6 Salem Road, London W2 4BU
175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010
www.ibtauris.com

Distributed in the United States and Canada Exclusively by Palgrave Macmillan
175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010

First published by Legini Press in 2006

Copyright © 2009, Nigel and Caroline Webb

The right of Nigel and Caroline Webb to be identified as the authors of this work has been asserted by the authors in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or any part thereof, may not be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

ISBN 978 1 84511 782 5

A full CIP record for this book is available from the British Library
A full CIP record is available from the Library of Congress

Library of Congress Catalog card: available

Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall.
Copy edited and typeset by Oxford Publishing Services, Oxford

Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
Introduction and a note on dates	ix
Map of Constantinople and environs	xiv
1 The Earl of Kinnoull Sails for Constantinople	1
Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull	1
The journey out	9
2 Life in Constantinople in the Early Eighteenth Century	16
Topography and local population	16
Houses and ‘palaces’	20
Health and safety	21
The weather and other natural phenomena	24
Belgrade village	25
Excursions	27
Turkish customs and habits	29
European women in Constantinople in the early eighteenth century	32
3 The New Ambassador Makes a Start	36
Introductions	36
Diplomatic matters	42
The Petric affair	49
Turkish affairs	54
Communications	62
The Levant Company and the embassy	67
4 Things Fall Apart	79
The Persian war	79
The war of the Polish succession	81
A Swedish sideshow	90
The dragomans Luca Chirico and Antonio Pisani	95
Louis Monier	97

CONTENTS

Further pressure	109
The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old	115
Some conclusions	125
5 Samuel Medley, Butler	129
At His Excellency's service	129
'Madam' and Mrs Sandys	133
Samuel Medley's colleagues and friends	137
The Butler observes	155
Personal matters	170
Appendix 1: Biographical notes in relation to the diary and the text	195
Appendix 2: Some members of the Medley family	209
Appendix 3: Currencies and their value	214
Notes	217
Bibliography	237
Glossary	246
Index	251

Acknowledgements

We feel especially indebted to Philip Mansel whose book *Constantinople: City of the World's Desire, 1453–1924*, with its excellent 22-page bibliography, was the starting point for our background reading.

We should also like to thank, particularly, the following people for their help, advice and encouragement:

Dr David Allen (University of St Andrew's); Matthew Bailey (National Portrait Gallery); Ray Barnett, who designed the first edition of this book; John Bowden; the late John Buchanan; Duncan Bull (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Peter and Reyhan Bull; Professor John Cairns (Edinburgh University); Dr Philip Carter (publication editor, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography); Selina Cohen; Professor Richard Dale; Anthony Earl; Professor Bill Forster; the late Michael Frewin; Liz Friend-Smith; Robert Frost (Yorkshire Archaeological Society); Dr Seth Gopin; Pamela Horn; Dr Simon Hyde; Scilla Landale; Doug McCarthy (National Maritime Museum); Sheila Mackenzie (National Library of Scotland); Professor Giandemetrio Marangoni (University of Padua); Christopher Medley, George Medley and Robin Medley; Emeritus Professor David Pailin; Dr Ruth Paley (History of Parliament); Andrew Parker of Printheus Northampton; Andrew Peppitt (The Devonshire Collection); Leidy Powell; Katja Robinson (National Galleries of Scotland); Alan Samson; Dr Richard Sharp; Murray Simpson; Eveline Sint Nicolaas (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam); Professor Harry Solomon; Lucie Stericker; Michael Stevens; Liesbeth Strasser (Nationaal Archief, The Hague); Dr Stephen Thompson; Nigel Wilkins (English Heritage); Philip Winterbottom (Royal Bank of Scotland Group Archives); Caroline Wittop Koning (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).

We would also like to thank the staff of the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the staff of the British Library; the staff and Syndics of Cambridge University Library; the staff of the Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies, the staff of The National Archives (formerly the Public Record Office) at Kew and of the National Archives of Scotland in Edinburgh; the staff and Trustees of the National Library of Scotland and the staff of Yorkshire Archaeological Society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Crown copyright material in the custody of the National Archives (formerly the Public Record Office) is reproduced by kind permission of the Keeper of Public Records.

Introduction and a note on dates

A Journal Begun this 16th day of October 1733 – Tuesday – Being the Day that Compleats 4 years Since I Came on Board Mr Addames Sloop at Wapping New Stairs and Entered Into the Retinue of his Excellencie the Earl of Kinnoull as his Stoor keeper & Cheife Buttlr But at this time Groome of the Chambers.

So begins the journal of Mr Samuel Medley, butler to Lord Kinnoull, the British Ambassador to Constantinople.

He seems not to have been at all a typical butler. Butler did not normally write diaries and Medley's intellect, as indicated by his notes of things he had read, seems beyond the normal expectations for such a post, although it was not uncommon for a servant to imitate the master's reading habits to some extent (and in some houses to borrow his books).¹ Further, he actually joined Lord Kinnoull, at the age of 62, as 'Groome of the Chambers', lowest among the male upper servants, in a role more likely to be fulfilled by a young man in his twenties.²

However, one feels that Lord Kinnoull cannot have regretted his decision to employ Medley, for whatever reason, because Medley comes across, through the pages of the diary, as having all those qualities of loyalty, humility, reliability, discretion and integrity³ that Kinnoull would have expected of a good butler whereas, already by July 1730, Kinnoull was writing that: 'in six months time, I don't believe that I shall have two [men servants] left out of twenty, which I brought with me.'⁴

Medley remained with him throughout his period as ambassador and presumably returned with him to England. Nothing definite is known of Medley before this period but he had a grown up son⁵ who was married in England during his father's absence and it is tempting to suspect that he was at this time a widower. It also seems highly likely that he came from the Pontefract area to which he returned after this trip abroad.

It is a consequence of the Medley family's pride in Samuel Medley,

butler, that the diary has survived and been passed down through nine generations to the present authors,⁶ who have felt that it deserved research and publication in some form. Our problem has been that many of the entries of greatest interest require extensive explanation of the historical or cultural background to permit the reader to make sense of them – much more than could sensibly be accommodated in footnotes.

Hence, we have taken the decision to interchange background for foreground and consign the full text of the diary to the website www.leginipress.co.uk, while quoting its most interesting passages, as appropriate, to complement the story of Lord Kinnoull and his embassy staff in Constantinople. We believe that this will help the general reader better to comprehend the picture as a whole, while still making the source material available for further research.

The first half of this book is therefore concerned mainly with placing in context the story of the embassy of George Hay, 8th Earl of Kinnoull, to Constantinople, 1729–36, of which period Medley's diary covers the second half. In Chapter 1, we introduce the Earl, giving a biographical sketch of the years leading up to his improbable appointment as ambassador, and we accompany him (and Medley) on the journey to Constantinople. In Chapter 2 we look at life in Constantinople at the time of their arrival there, while Chapters 3 and 4 cover the extraordinary story of Lord Kinnoull's embassy and the misjudgements and intrigues leading to his recall. Here we have included quotations from his butler's diary where relevant, and have introduced the political and historical background where we hope it will be found most helpful in enabling the reader to understand the attitudes and actions of those involved.

With this background, the reader is then in a good position, should he or she so wish, to dip into the diary itself using the website www.leginipress.co.uk. This is likely to raise various questions, particularly about the roles of those people mentioned who are not central to the embassy story. In Chapter 5, therefore, we take Medley's viewpoint and focus on the diary itself under various headings, attempting some deductions about its author.

Medley's diary contains many observations on the writer's health and the weather; many brief accounts of short excursions, for pleasure or for house business, with friends and colleagues; plenty of factual observations on who comes to the house or who 'My Lord' goes to visit; a few brief accounts of news of major happenings at Constantinople or elsewhere (the reliability of which news he rightly often questions).

It also includes a few observations – one could wish for more – on those around him whose habits, customs or beliefs he finds sufficiently different from his own to demand comment. It is only in this sort of context that he permits himself the addition of a note of criticism to his normally dispassionate observations. ‘Popery’, in particular, arouses him, as on 28 November 1734:

I went in the State Liveray – to St demetree Chappel – the funerall of M^r Temoneys aunt a young woman where I Se more Superstition than I have Seen Before – w^{ch} is to teadious and vexatious to Express – a 100 & more Popeish priests – some 100^d of wax Candles all the way Beside flamb’g Incence holly watter &c – L^d Enable me to keep my heart wth Dilligence to y^e truth as it is in Jesus – wthout Supertition.⁷

In this case, however, he has confused Greek Orthodox ceremony with ‘popery’!

What is conspicuously missing is any significant opinion on or description of those who move in Lord Kinnoull’s circle, or of Lord Kinnoull himself. That is perhaps not surprising in that ‘The servant was ... expected to know his place and under all circumstances to maintain a deferential manner, whatever his private thoughts’⁸ and, doubtless, Medley will have made this attitude a habit of mind from which, even in his private diary, he will have thought it unwise (if not actually immoral) to stray.

As a bonus, though, we find, on the pages opposite the daily entries, quotations from a range of contemporary religious and other writers, in prose and verse, with occasional critical comment from Medley. The books he was reading could have belonged to Lord Kinnoull or could have been obtained from the Levant Company library to which it is likely that Medley would have had access (although he never mentions it). Medley’s prose and poetry quotations are published in full, with notes, on the website www.leginipress.co.uk, but are also summarized, with comment, in Chapter 5. They are of interest as an additional source to illuminate Medley’s character but they are also of special importance to those with an interest in the literature of the period and its readership.

Medley continued the journal until 9 November 1736, when he evidently ran out of steam. He had, in fact, lost enthusiasm for writing more than one line a day, normally, about a year earlier and the reader will much regret that he did not think to start the diary four years earlier,

when the ship left England to carry him and his master, then the new ambassador, to Constantinople.

On the flyleaf of the diary is the following inscription:

‘This diary was kept in Turkey at Constantinople by my great Grandfather M^r Sam^l Medley.

Signed by me Sam^l Medley Chatham 2 July 1851.’

This Samuel Medley (1769–1857),⁹ author, artist, member of the Stock Exchange and active Baptist who was associated with the foundation of University College London, wrote a biography¹⁰ of his father the Reverend Samuel Medley (1738–99)¹¹ within which he actually devoted 37 pages to his great grandfather, the butler. He describes him as ‘a man of lively wit, sound understanding, great penetration, and unaffected piety’ and says that he wrote not only the Constantinople diary but also ‘his Miscellaneous Observations’ (which were, in fact, apparently based on his notes on the pages opposite the daily entries) and ‘his more private experience as a Christian (which) was begun when he must have been 70 years of age’ (that is, probably on his return from Constantinople).

In further description of his great grandfather, he writes:

He was particularly noted for his cheerfulness, and was a pleasing example of remarkable confidence in God, as it respected his providential dispensations, frequently saying, he never could fret five minutes in his life, let things look ever so dark. This even disposition, it appears, arose from a settled persuasion of the wisdom, power and goodness that God, who governs, sustains, and provides for all; especially for those who could claim so dear a relation, as it was his high honour and peculiar privilege to do, in calling this God his Father, which, with the simplicity of an affectionate child, he a hundred times repeats.

Certainly, whenever there is an improvement from his periodical brushes with the gout, Samuel the butler is quick to give God the credit, as for example on 17 June 1736, when he says ‘Better in my foot Bbm^gg [Blessed be my Good God].’ Perhaps Samuel Medley, the author and artist, viewed his great grandfather through spectacles tinted with the flush of his own success in life, for he described the butler not as a butler but as having ‘held a respectable situation in the suite of the Earl of

INTRODUCTION AND A NOTE ON DATES

Kinnoull, in his embassy from the British court to Constantinople'. His sister's version, in a rival biography¹² of her father, even promotes the butler to 'Secretary to the Earl of Kinnoull'!

He says that, after returning from Constantinople, his great grandfather 'ended his days at Pomfret (= Pontefract), in Yorkshire, in a good old age, *coming in like a shock of corn in its season.*'



In discussing the political machinations of the period, the authors have sometimes followed Lord Kinnoull or his butler in describing the Ottoman Empire as Turkish; the Holy Roman Empire as Austrian or German; the States General as Dutch: historians are asked to bear with this.

A NOTE ON DATES

In the 1730s, the Italian, German, Spanish and Portuguese states were following the Gregorian calendar (introduced in 1582 by Pope Gregory XIII) while England, Russia, Sweden and Greece still followed the Julian calendar. Thus, where a letter is dated 3 March 1731 OS (Old Style), this indicates the Julian date in use in England and sometimes this date may be shown as 3 March 1731/32. The equivalent continental date is 14 March 1732.

Lord Chesterfield's Act 1751–52 was designed to change from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar. Under the Julian calendar the year ran from 25 March to the following 24 March; under the Gregorian, from 1 January to 31 December. There was also 11 days difference. To achieve the change, 1752 began on 1 January and, that year, 2 September was followed by 14 September, thus losing 11 days (which caused some rioting).

We have done our best to follow the convention used by many other authors writing about this period and have used, normally, the contemporary English calendar, 'OS', as regards the date and month, while giving the year as if beginning on 1 January, and not using the contemporary English year beginning on 25 March. Any exceptions to this, where we have mentioned continental dates, are designated 'NS'.



Map of Constantinople and environs.

1

The Earl of Kinnoull Sails for Constantinople

INTRODUCING THE EARL OF KINNOULL

GEORGE HAY, 8th Earl of Kinnoull, was born in 1689. He had had a somewhat chequered career before being appointed British ambassador to the Sublime Porte in 1729. He became Viscount Dupplin in 1709, the year of his marriage to Abigail Harley, younger daughter of Sir Robert Harley, later 1st Earl of Oxford and Queen Anne's Lord High Treasurer. Between 1710 and 1723, the couple had ten children, four boys and six girls.

Lady Abigail seems to have inspired the affection of those who knew her. One visitor to the Kinnoull family seat, Dupplin House, in Perthshire, where the Dupplins were living at the time, described her as 'the fine lady who is mistress of it, at the head of her family of most delicate children.'¹ Lady Abigail's letters show her to be a fond and caring parent.

But Dupplin House was too far from the centre of political life and, in any case, it was the home of Dupplin's father, the 7th Earl. Shortly after their first child Thomas was born in 1710 in Scotland, the Dupplins left on a house-hunting expedition to London. The baby was entrusted to Sir Patrick Murray of Ochertyre, an old family friend, and his wife, who received frequent letters from Abigail, inquiring after Thomas's health:

I'm extremely glad to hear my dear little boy is so well and takes to his feet. ... I long to see my dear Child. I dream of him every night; Pray remember me to nurse ... tell her I heartily rejoice y^r her Master has a tooth ... pray let me know if his tooth be on the upper or lower side.²

In the early years Lady Abigail expressed her satisfaction with married life: in connection with her brother's marriage she wrote: 'I hope he will make as good a Husband as my L^d Dupplin. I need say no more to commend him.'³ As a young man George Hay seemed destined for a successful career. With Harley's help,⁴ he became the member of parliament for Fowey in 1710, aged 21. For Harley, he was a valuable link to Scottish politicians. He 'was classed as a Tory on the "Hanover list" of 1710 and named as a "worthy patriot".⁵ In 1711 he was appointed as a Teller of the Exchequer. Speaker Bromley wrote of this appointment in glowing terms to the Earl of Oxford, Dupplin's father-in-law: 'He is so pretty a gentleman, so generally well beloved ... that their friends will universally approve it.'⁶

In addition to his Scottish title, George Hay was granted the title of Baron Hay of Pedwardine in 1711 as one of the 12 English peers created by Sir Robert Harley to ensure the passage of the Treaty of Utrecht through the House of Lords.

However, by 1714 Dupplin had unfortunately lost his place as Teller. This seems to have been through no fault of his but was, rather, on account of his close association with Harley who resigned from the post of Lord High Treasurer a few days before the death of Queen Anne. Dr William Stratford of Christchurch College, Oxford, a friend of the Harley family and a prolific correspondent, wrote to Edward Harley, Abigail's brother, that: 'Lord and Lady Dupplin are wisely resolving to suit their expenses to their circumstances, they are going to part with their house in town and to retire wholly to the country.'⁷ Dupplin had resolved to buy an estate in Yorkshire for his growing family; in 1713 he purchased Brodsworth House near Pontefract and he, Lady Abigail and their sons Thomas and Robert moved in.

However, unfortunately for him and for the family, in 1715 he was arrested, along with others, including his own father, and imprisoned in the Tower of London on suspicion of having been involved in the Jacobite rising of that year. This was not surprising because his younger brother, John Hay of Cromlix, was deeply involved, as was the Earl of Mar whose late wife Margaret had been the sister of George and John Hay. Dupplin was in due course admitted to bail, in 1716, and formally cleared in 1717; all the properties of the Earl of Mar and of John Hay were, however, forfeited and he and Mar followed the Pretender to Avignon and then Rome.⁸

Dupplin later wrote to his uncle, Lord Foley: 'I had long before my

imprisonment taken the resolution to retire into the Country in hopes to pass my time there in a very private manner at a distance from all publick affairs. And to that End I had purchased a little thing in Yorkshire.⁹ George Hay added to the not insubstantial Brodsworth house and estate, over the years, by purchasing more land, and it became the centre of family life for Abigail and her children, most of whom were born there. She wrote to her Harley aunt from there, saying: ‘Thank God that I can live here with so much satisfaction and delight.’¹⁰ In the four years following his release from prison, Dupplin appears to have spent much time in Yorkshire attending to his new estate. Abigail wrote that ‘never any one was so full of business now as he is between the stables, garden and hay makers he is never in the house in daylight but to eat his dinner.’¹¹

There are, however, letters to Abigail’s brother Edward Harley in 1718, from the poet Matthew Prior who was a friend of his, speaking affectionately of ‘Dup and Dupplinia’, with whom he dines in Lincoln’s Inn Fields, indicating time spent by both of them in London as well as Yorkshire. Prior, Swift and Pope were all friendly with Harley and Prior, who eventually died at Harley’s home, and Wimpole, evidently knew the Dupplins well. His letter of 10 September 1718 reports that ‘Little Tommy Haye has the smallpox of a very good kind and is likely to do well’ and, by 29 September 1718, ‘little Dup is perfectly recovered’.¹²

Dupplin succeeded to the title of Earl of Kinnoull on the death of his father in 1719 and, though trustees were mainly responsible for running the Scottish estates, there was inevitable business to be attended to in Scotland, and Dupplin House was now another potential home for the family. On occasion Lady Abigail was left at Dupplin House with the children while her husband remained in London. She asked her brother Edward to write to her often: ‘It is charity now I am so far from all my friends.’¹³ However, her loyalty to her husband was unswerving. She wrote from Edinburgh, in 1721, that the place was dull, but ‘I have so much of my Lords company for he is almost always at home & that makes any place agreeable.’¹⁴

By 1720, the new Lord Kinnoull was spending much time in London again, playing an active part in investment in the South Sea Company. Harley, his father-in-law, had been chief founder or regulator of the South Sea Company and its governor from 1711; Kinnoull was appointed commissioner for taking subscriptions to the Company in that year.¹⁵ Kinnoull wrote to Harley that: ‘I hope to make such profit in the South

Sea Stock as to make the Dear Children's provision very easie & yr. Daughter's Comfort & the Care of those Dear Babies being my Greatest Concern in this World.'¹⁶ Kinnoull's personal bank account at Drummond's Bank in London¹⁷ doubtless gives a far-from-complete picture of his financial transactions, but between 9 April and 2 June of 1720, for instance, there were in-payments of £7171 and outgoings of £5972: substantial sums for him to be handling privately.

As well as investing himself, he was approached by others from both Scotland and Yorkshire, no doubt knowing of his connection with Lord Oxford, to subscribe on their behalf. One Mr Clelland was advised by Kinnoull to invest, but had no ready cash to advance. Writing to Lord Grange, another potential investor, Clelland remarked of Kinnoull: 'I would not ask him why he who had so much and had made so much in it would not advance it himself.'¹⁸ This remark implies that Kinnoull had made substantial amounts of money or, at least, that others thought he had done so. Stratford, writing to Edward Harley, observed with hope: 'I would congratulate him [Kinnoull] too upon his gains in the South Sea. When his younger children are largely provided for, I hope the overplus will go to support episcopal seminaries in his own fatherland.'¹⁹ In 1712, Stratford himself had ventured 'all the little ready money that I have' in the South Sea Company.²⁰ However, Lady Abigail was less happy with this craze: 'The town is quite mad about the South Sea. ... It is being very unfashionable not to be in the South Sea. I am sorry to say, I am out of the fashion.'²¹ But she was wise to be unfashionable and, for reasons apparently mainly associated with the collapse of the South Sea Company, the family's finances seem to have suffered serious problems in the early 1720s. Not long into 1721 Kinnoull was asking Sir Robert Harley, his father-in-law and a trustee of the estate, permission to sell an indemnity for £17,000.²²

But Harley was upset by what he saw as Kinnoull's dissimulation: 'Had he let me know that he had plung'd himself & that this was the best way (perhaps the only) to extricate himself from his difficulties, it would have moovd compassion' (and if Kinnoull had been honest about his circumstances) 'it would have given me some hopes that experience would have curd him of ... Buble hunting, w^{ch} I do not expect.'²³ In the first half of 1722, most of the payments into Kinnoull's Drummond's bank account were from sale of South Sea stock and by the second half of 1723 the turnover had fallen to less than £1000 for the six-month period with more than half the income being derived from a Scottish source.²⁴

With business on the wane and affairs in Scotland requiring attention, Kinnoull seems to have felt the need to reduce expenditure in Yorkshire and to maintain a presence at Dupplin House as well as in London. Stratford writes to Harley that ‘Your sister Kinnoull, with all those ‘bearn’ that are with her, is ordered by her Lord to follow him to Kinnoull, and is now on the road thither.’ Stratford believes Kinnoull intends to leave her there and he adds: ‘I wish you may ever see your sister again.’²⁵ To add to his difficulties, in 1722 Kinnoull was under investigation again, in connection with the Laver conspiracy, as regards possible Jacobite sympathies,²⁶ probably not without good cause since it was not until 1723 that, whether on account of his personal finances or out of caution, he ceased giving secret financial support to his younger brother John, who was then heavily involved with the Pretender’s activities.²⁷

In August 1723, Lady Abigail explained to her aunt that a settlement had been made regarding the Scottish estates, with Sir Patrick Murray as one of the trustees: ‘every one of the children are therein provided for; tho’ it is very small, but I hope it will please God to spare my L^d to clear his Estate & see his Children disposed of & then I don’t doubt that he will do better for them’.²⁸ By this time the family consisted of four boys and six girls, so it was no trivial matter to ensure that they were adequately provided for.

Years later she wrote to Sir Patrick praising her children and saying that ‘it is the very greatest comfort I have in this life to see my Children so hopefull and deserving.’²⁹ She expressed her deep gratitude for his long-term support of her and her family.

This settlement seems also to have taken some immediate pressure off Kinnoull’s financial situation in London. Whereas he had found it necessary to transfer £1100 to his wife from his Drummond’s Bank account in 1721, after July 1723 there were no further payments from this source.³⁰ However, in early 1724, William Drummond, in Edinburgh, a trustee of the Kinnoull estates, was working to disentangle Kinnoull from a complicated string of debts, to the tune of over £6000, related at least in part to South Sea Company investments.³¹

Ever loyal, Lady Abigail did her best to impress her aunt with her husband’s generous nature and good intentions. On the death of a certain Dr Bower, whom Kinnoull had helped financially, she wrote: ‘he [Dr Bower] had wanted bread if it had not been for my L^d’s kindness to him which was very well bestowed.’³² But in October 1724 Stratford is

condemning Kinnoull, with extraordinary viciousness, for unspecified reasons:

[He] uses such a wife and his own family, in so vile a manner. But if I am informed right, he is likely to pay for it in this world, and will not be able to get so much as bread in a little time. Should that be his case ... I think he ought to be left to die in a ditch.³³

It seems hard to believe that such strong condemnation can have been triggered solely by Kinnoull's financial misfortune and mismanagement. From the context of these remarks, it seems that in fact Kinnoull is being condemned by Stratford more for what he has or has not done in connection with the arrest of Marjory Hay (wife of Kinnoull's Jacobite brother John, who had come to England in search of funds for the Pretender's cause) than for the way he 'uses' his wife and family.

Exactly what was the state of the personal relationship, by 1724, between Kinnoull, based in Whitehall, and Lady Abigail, at Dupplin House, we do not know. But when her father died in May, Kinnoull, who was in London, did not go north but wrote to the faithful Sir Patrick Murray asking him to break the news to her.³⁴

By 1726 matters seem to have been no better financially; Stratford knew that Abigail's brother, Edward Harley, was helping the family with money and advised: 'Be as private as you will in your relief of them ... [Kinnoull] will trust that you will not see them starve.'³⁵ It appears that Kinnoull was never good at managing his financial affairs and found little time for his Scottish estates, even after his father's death. As early as 1713 he was asking Sir Patrick Murray to manage his affairs in Scotland and hold his power of attorney, hoping that he 'would be pleased to act in everything wth relation to my estates & money in Scotland arising from thence.'³⁶ To be fair, though, he can hardly have been expected to foresee the loss of his lucrative job as teller to the exchequer or the disaster that befell the South Sea Company.

As far as the estate at Brodsworth was concerned, money was often tight here, with creditors having to press for payment and with Lady Abigail perpetually short of cash. In 1726 she wrote to Sir Patrick Murray, thanking him for advancing the fares to enable her young children to travel from Dupplin to Brodsworth, and gratefully mentioning trustees of the Kinnoull family estates.³⁷ The trustees who were based in Edinburgh and included Sir Patrick Murray apparently made Kinnoull

an allowance of £2500 a year in 1729.³⁸ The trust appears to have been set up between 1713 and the death of the 7th Earl in 1719.

Lady Abigail's friends and family frequently expressed their concerns about the way she was treated. Her aunt, Abigail Harley, thought it quite wrong that Kinnoull should leave his wife to travel south from Scotland alone with the children early in 1726, and reveals her low opinion of him: 'I am not surprised he leaves them to shift for themselves in a long journey and through such dangerous ways.' By March 1726, Lady Abigail had arrived in town and 'keeps up her spirits to a wonder, at least hides her trouble to a great degree' but 'her circumstances are very deplorable'.³⁹

Kinnoull's eldest son Thomas, by then known as Viscount Dupplin, also suffered because funds were short. He went up to Christchurch in 1726, with his arrival there noted by Stratford who observed that Dupplin 'must be on a frugal footing' so far as his lodgings were concerned.⁴⁰ Stratford later wrote to Edward Harley: 'Do you know that, by Sir Robert's [i.e. Walpole's] interest, the King allows somewhat for the maintenance of Dup[plin] here?'⁴¹ In 1728 he told Harley that Dupplin had 'owned that he and his brother [Robert] could not yet come down [from Oxford] because the father could not furnish them with any [money]'.⁴² When, the following year, Lord Kinnoull was appointed ambassador to Constantinople, Dupplin accompanied his father who hoped that this experience might increase his son's chances of employment.

But William Drummond believed that:

The reason certainly for My Lord Kinnoulls takeing Lord Dupplin with him is that his allowance of £2500 Ster ... can but Just support him at Constantinople and so cannot spare anie thing for Lord Dupplin and indeed to leave him behind without fund for his support would be hard enough.⁴³

Certainly, the appointment appeared not to promise any immediate improvement to Kinnoull's finances and Lady Kinnoull and family were apparently expected to live on the rental from the lands at Brodsworth, where she was very actively involved with running the estate, with the help of the steward Jos Dickinson.⁴⁴

It is something of a puzzle to know why Kinnoull was selected to be ambassador in Constantinople, lacking, as he did, any experience in the diplomatic field and given the history of suspicions of Jacobite sym-

pathies. In a letter to Horace Walpole from Constantinople Kinnoull revealed that his appointment was due to the patronage of William Cavendish, second Duke of Devonshire ‘that Great person, who as he was a father to me, was likewise a true friend and support’.

The Duke of Devonshire was a Whig whose wealth gave him extensive influence; he also held high office. Walpole would certainly have given his recommendations careful consideration for these reasons alone. Before succeeding to the title, Devonshire had been one of the MPs for Yorkshire, where Hay had estates. He was also one of the commissioners to negotiate the Treaty of Union with Scotland.⁴⁵

In a letter to Horace Walpole, Kinnoull also gave credit to ‘your brother Sir Robert Walpole [who] for many years favour’d me with his particular affection and esteem. I owe my being employed to the good opinion he was pleased to have of me.’⁴⁶ An earlier letter from Horace Walpole to Kinnoull also refers to the Duke of Devonshire as ‘the great Person by whose credit your Lordship was employed’.⁴⁷

Kinnoull did not apparently think much of the job initially: ‘The Employment that the King has honoured me with is not a great one. [However,] ... I shall certainly have an Opportunity to do real Service to my family, in a very honourable way and entirely Consistent wth my Duty to the King and to the [Levant] Company.’⁴⁸ But Lady Abigail would presumably have welcomed her husband’s appointment as ambassador in 1729, even though it was not practical for her and the large family to go with him; Stratford also thought it a good thing: ‘I think it very happy for Her and her Family that Her Lord goes Abroad. He may if he is not void of common sense ... retrieve his Affairs in some measure in that post.’⁴⁹ At that time, the ambassador, though appointed by the King and answerable to the Secretary of State the Duke of Newcastle, was largely financed by, and effectively an employee of, the Levant Company, and was expected to devote a good proportion of his time and energy to the welfare of the merchants and their trading enterprises. No doubt Kinnoull hoped to earn enough money from his post to improve his financial position at home. However, like previous and later ambassadors, he did not find the financial arrangements of the employment at all satisfactory, as we shall see in Chapter 3 under the section entitled *The Levant Company and the embassy*.

Others had their own opinions of this appointment. William Drummond, brother of Kinnoull’s banker, declared, in a letter to Sir Patrick Murray: ‘Some posts agoe my brother wrote me that My Lord

was to be cleared out one way or another from London. ... I hope all shall be for his own families good at last.' He believes that his brother Andrew, of Drummond's Bank, 'has done my Lord great Service at this Juncture with the Turkie Company',⁵⁰ presumably to try and overcome the known misgivings of the Levant merchants at the King's appointment of Kinnoull, for he had no more experience of business such as theirs than he did of diplomacy.⁵¹

Kinnoull and his eldest son finally left England on HMS *Torrington* late in 1729 and arrived in Constantinople in April 1730, with Samuel Medley and the other servants on board. To the last he was sending instructions to his faithful friend Sir Patrick Murray in Scotland: 'I have desired Mr Ranken to send me some Oatmeal, some Salt Salmond & some Herrings & some Scots Snuff every year. Pray order him to get them all in perfection.'⁵² One wonders if William Ranken, his steward at Dupplin, dispatched these annually to Constantinople, and in what state they arrived.

THE JOURNEY OUT

There are several accounts of Lord Kinnoull's journey from England to Constantinople in 1729, as well as his own observations in letters to the Duke of Newcastle (Secretary of State) and others. His private secretary, William Sandys, wrote a long account of the voyage to Charles Delafaye, Under-secretary of State,⁵³ mainly to set out a list of complaints against the captain of the British man of war, HMS *Torrington*, which carried the party. Then there is the simple, factual log of the *Torrington* that Captain Philip Vincent kept.⁵⁴ Another account, in French, was written by César de Saussure, a young adventurer originally from Lausanne. The beginning of de Saussure's account is dated 5 October 1729.⁵⁵ Writing to a friend, he explained that after four years in England he was ready to embark on a further round of travels in Europe. Hearing that Kinnoull was to replace Abraham Stanyan as British ambassador in Constantinople, he had found a mutual acquaintance in London to introduce him to Kinnoull who had received him courteously and agreed to allow him to accompany the embassy party to Turkey.

Kinnoull visited the ship on 2 September after which, under a column headed 'Remarkable Observations & Accidents on board his Majts Ship *Torrington*', Captain Vincent wrote: 'Saluted the Earle of Kinnoull with 15 guns at his going ashore from our Ship.'⁵⁶ Presumably, this visit was to negotiate arrangements for his party but it was not until six o'clock on

the evening of 5 October that de Saussure embarked at the Tower of London on a small boat carrying Kinnoull's baggage and some of his servants to the ship at the mouth of the Thames. Medley, writing the first entry in his diary four years after the event, says he left Wapping on the 16th; presumably, though, he was one of the servants on de Saussure's boat. (De Saussure gives 5 October as the date and he uses Old Style, which Medley also normally uses throughout the diary. Very probably Medley obtained this date from his master who, at that time, was using New Style dating, which would have reckoned it as 16th.)

At five o'clock the next morning they found very rough seas at the river mouth, and had considerable difficulty boarding the ship, over the following three hours.

The *Torrington* (originally built in 1676 and named the *Charles Galley*) had been recently rebuilt and this was to be its first voyage under its new name,⁵⁷ with a crew of 200 under Captain Vincent. The following day the *Torrington* set sail for Portsmouth where Kinnoull and the rest of the party were to embark, finally arriving at Spithead on 25 October. Kinnoull was eventually able to board on 8 November, but, to his dismay and financial embarrassment, it was then a further five weeks before the *Torrington* eventually set sail. They left on 14 December in good weather, with a brisk north-easterly blowing.

Why had nearly two months elapsed between the advance party leaving London and the final departure from Spithead? Sandys reports that Kinnoull was ready to embark on 26 October but that the captain declared there were still repairs outstanding. From 8 November, Captain Vincent kept postponing their departure on the grounds of contrary winds. Sandys did not believe this was true: 'all the Captains at Spithead were surprised what could be the meaning that we never took the proper advantages of the Winds.'⁵⁸ He believed that Vincent still had personal business to attend to. Kinnoull remained on board for the entire five weeks, not wishing to give Vincent any excuse for delaying their voyage further: 'I have not set my foot on shore since 8th of November.'⁵⁹

The *Torrington* reached Lisbon on 1 January 1730 where the British ambassador to Portugal, Lord Tyrawley came aboard. Again, Captain Vincent delayed their departure, this time for five weeks. Sandys believed this was to allow the captain to embark 'a freight of Moidores (Portuguese gold coins) and Barrs of Gold to carry to Genoa and other places'; the Portuguese authorities forbade such cargo, but being a British man of war, the *Torrington* was not liable to be searched. Sandys also deplored the fact

that ‘every week that the Voyage was prolonged His Excy’s Expencc in maintaining a great number of Servants on Board was very much increased.’⁶⁰ Kinnoull wrote to Newcastle that he was ‘fatigued ... after being aboard five weeks at Spithead and eighteen Days mostly in bad weather at sea’.⁶¹ However, there were consolations, as he reported to Newcastle that he had had an audience with the King and Queen of Portugal, and the Prince and Princess of Brazil.

Kinnoull’s son, Lord Dupplin, wrote to his aunt, the countess of Oxford, from Lisbon:

We anchored here on Wednesday ... since when L^d Tyrawley has entertained me with y^e greatest civility, & this day my Father & I were introduced to y^e King and Queen. The character of y^e Portuguese people is generally represented very indifferent, being lookt upon as a proud, stubborn, ignorant people.⁶²

The party finally set sail from Lisbon on 31 January, calling at Gibraltar on 4 February and Port Mahon on the 13th. From the 19th to the 26th they were anchored off Genoa and from 28 to 18 March off Livorno, then known by the British as Leghorn.⁶³ (We have used Old Style dates in the text above. Kinnoull in fact uses New Style dates in his letter, which makes them 11 days further advanced than those of de Saussure.)

By this stage Sandys could no longer contain his anger at Vincent. The problem was not just the endless delays, but the captain’s attitude to Kinnoull right from the start of the journey. When Kinnoull came on board at Spithead, he ‘was receiv’d with no Salute which is the usual Compliment paid to His Majesty’s Ambassador.’ Sandys later speaks of Vincent’s ‘want of Good Will’ and his ‘most haughty and Insolent Manner’. At Livorno the captain did fire the usual salute when Kinnoull left the ship, but soon reverted to his former behaviour:

when His Excy went on Board attended by the Consul & others, the Capt receiv’d him with less Respect than he would a private man, no Respect paid to his Person, no Salute given to his Character, tho he had taken his Character of Amb^t upon him while he was at Leghorn.⁶⁴

The *Torrington* was more than two weeks at Livorno, finally departing on 18 March. Malta was the next port of call on 27 March, where they

stayed for four days. Here Sandys again found fault with Captain Vincent. This time there was a last-minute dinner invitation that Vincent accepted from the 'General of the Maltese Galleys' even though the *Torrington's* anchors were up and it was ready to sail in a fair wind. When Kinnoull remonstrated with the captain, Sandys declared that:

You will hardly believe that any man cou'd give the Answer that the Capt did. That he was Master and not to be directed by any Body. That he wou'd stay there rather because His Excy had desired the Contrary; for if he should comply with what His Excy proposed, he said, it wou'd look as if he had not an intire Authority which he wou'd maintain.

Vincent then left the ship, ordering his first lieutenant Mr Orchard to take the *Torrington* out of the harbour, whereupon Orchard ran the ship onto a rock; only the prompt action of the British consul Mr Young, who happened to be on board, saved the situation.⁶⁵

After all this the ship left Malta on 31 March. De Saussure gave details of the final leg to Constantinople. They passed between Cerigo and Cerigotto, then between '*l'Île Longue e celle de Zia; et entre le Négrepont et l'Île d'Andros*'. They then anchored off Ipsera and two days later dropped anchor between Tenedos and '*le continent de l'Asie, vis à vis des Ruines de Troye*'.⁶⁶ Finally they were able to enter the Dardanelles, where they passed between two Turkish castles, one on the European shore and the other on the Asian. As night was coming on, the captain dropped anchor and the English consul of the Dardanelles came on board, with a dragoman (i.e. interpreter) from the British ambassador. Two days later the ship was in the Sea of Marmara, and arrived off Constantinople in the evening of 14 April,⁶⁷ having taken four months to complete the journey.

De Saussure reported that the first secretary of the outgoing ambassador, Stanyan, and his master of horse came on board to greet Kinnoull, along with the chancellor and treasurer of the Levant Company, and five or six merchants. Kinnoull then disembarked, with the crew giving him three cheers or '*hourrás*'. This time Captain Vincent did his duty and gave the ambassador the usual 21-gun salute. De Saussure stayed that night on board, before disembarking the next day to lodge with a watch maker, a fellow countryman from Geneva, but not before he was lucky enough to see a spectacle of great interest to someone newly arrived in Turkey.

The Sultan or Grand Signor was seen to embark on one of his galleys from a kiosk near the Seraglio, on his way to his palace at Beshiktash on the Bosphorus. De Saussure described the boat as having '24 rowers' and as being '*extremement ornée et embellie de beaucoup de dorure, de sculpture et de peinture*'. The Sultan sat on a magnificent 'sopha' in the prow, beneath a sort of pavilion of red velvet. He was clearly interested in this British warship as he ordered the Bostangi-Bashi to row near the *Torrington*, and spent about ten minutes looking at it. (This steersman of the royal barge was the head gardener as well as the chief executioner.)

As he left, the captain of the *Torrington* ordered a 21-gun salute. Half an hour later the grand vizier's boat also came past; this had only 12 oarsmen and a pavilion of green velvet. The grand vizier was head of the administration of the Ottoman Empire, and a very important figure in relations between the state and all foreign ambassadors. Once again the *Torrington* fired its guns, this time with a 15-gun salute.⁶⁸

Sandys had no more to say about the voyage after the problems at Malta. However, his letter to Delafaye continued to castigate Captain Vincent. He emphasized that Kinnoull had instructed all his retinue to be civil to the captain, 'but no good usage cou'd work upon him, it was washing a Blackamoor for not only he, but such of his People as he had an Influence Upon, behaved themselves at all times very indecently towards His Excy'. Sandys said that Kinnoull had asked him to write to Delafaye rather than bother Newcastle with this sorry tale, and that Kinnoull would leave it to Delafaye whether to take any action against the captain or not. Sandys also stated that Kinnoull had decided to appoint him as *Cancellier* or Chancellor to the Levant Company, and he hoped that the Duke of Newcastle would approve this.

The only other incident of interest on the voyage to Constantinople was the curious complaint made to the Duke of Newcastle by some members of the Levant Company. Newcastle wrote to Kinnoull that the 'Turkey Co.' had 'taken umbrage at some women that they alledge are gone in the same ship as you to Constantinople', and he asked for comments.⁶⁹ Neither party can have been pleased to have had to correspond on so apparently trivial a matter at the start of Kinnoull's embassy, but Kinnoull explains himself in a suitably dignified manner:

I return your Grace my most humble thanks for your friendship in this Affair for these Gentlemen might have done me a great Injury, if they had made any representation to the King, upon such a

Subject. Since their anger is grounded upon a mistake & must proceed from a Number of Malicious lyes, that a young fellow One Gregory, that was not satisfied with his Accommodation in the ship, spread all over London⁷⁰ Which I had an Acc^t. of & which gave me no uneasiness, not believing it possible that any one would give Credit to the lyes & storys of Such a Worthless young fellow.

My Lord, All the Women that I brought here with me are servants – to clean my house & wash my Linnen and they are turn'd so idle here that I resolved to Send them all back before I recd. Yr. Graces letter.

My steward brought his wife & children with him ... [and] ... I brought a French Cook with me & he must have his wife with him too – but I discharg'd them in about a Month after my arrival.

...

So that your Grace may Assure the duke of Chandos that if the Turkey Company have no reason to complain of me, but with relation to my women, I shall be very happy in their Service. For in a very little time I shall not have one English woman left: they all return to their several countreys ... and I must content my self to have my house cleaned & my Linnen washed by Greek women; who are very indifferent servants, tho' the better Sort of them are the most Beautiful women in the world.⁷¹

There is some suggestion here that some Levant Company merchants were displeased about Kinnoull's appointment and were using any excuse to discredit him from the start. Gregory had left the ship and Kinnoull's service on 13 November 1729 and the story obviously spread and became part of London gossip, with Alexander Pope referring disparagingly to 'K-l's lewd cargo.'⁷² Pope takes the opportunity to air two pieces of scandal in the same line: 'K-l's lewd Cargo, or Ty-y's crew'. The second part refers to James O'Hara, Baron Tyrawley (1690–1773). He was the ambassador to Portugal who had welcomed Kinnoull to Lisbon and of whom Walpole wrote, some years later: 'My Lord Tyrawley is come from Portugal, and has brought three wives and fourteen children'.⁷³

However, another curious feature of this story is that none of these women, not even the wives Kinnoull mentioned, appear on the passenger list for the *Torrington* on its outward journey. Presumably, Kinnoull would have supplied this list to the captain; however, the equivalent list for the return journey, when Stanyan was on board, appears to have

included the women travelling in his party – three of them, listed specifically, by name.⁷⁴ Did Kinnoull, in fact, have something to hide? As we shall see, one person at least was going to claim that he had a mistress in Constantinople very soon after his arrival.

2

Life in Constantinople in the Early Eighteenth Century

SAMUEL MEDLEY was aged 63 when he arrived in Constantinople with the Earl of Kinnoull. The city he found was renowned for the splendour of its setting on the Bosphorus, but many of its features must have seemed very strange to an elderly Englishman. What was life like in Constantinople in the 1730s and how did Medley react to what he saw?

TOPOGRAPHY AND LOCAL POPULATION

It has been estimated that the population numbered between six and seven hundred thousand in 1690.¹ It was made up of Turks, Armenians, Greeks, Jews, Italians and other Europeans or Franks, as they were known, from many different countries. Some of the Franks were permanent residents, such as the English merchant, Robert Constantine whose daughter married the Austrian Resident Thalmann, and the Swiss watchmaker named Jacob Marchant with whom de Saussure lodged on arrival; both these men had lived in Constantinople for more than thirty years.²

The Franks mainly operated the trade between the Ottoman Empire and Christendom, with the Turks interested chiefly in trade within the Empire in such profitable areas as the supply of food to the capital. A Frenchman writing in the 1770s summed up relations thus:

The European merchant at Constantinople has daily transactions with Turks, Greeks, Armenians, and Jews; he finds the Turk hard

to deal with, and always covetous, but generally the slave of his promise: the Greek sharp and subtle, with a dash of the cheat in his character: the Jew tricking, and a liar: the Armenian dull, avaricious and awkward (*sic*).³

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, whose husband was British ambassador from 1716 to 1718, believed that the Jews

have drawn the whole trade of the empire into their hands, partly by the firm union among themselves, and partly by the idle temper and want of industry in the Turks. ... Even the English, French and Italian merchants, who are sensible of their artifices, are, however, forced to entrust their affairs to their negotiation.⁴

Frankish opinions about the Turks differed. Paul Rycaut, some 60 years earlier, had been of the view that 'a Turk is not capable of real friendship towards a Christian.'⁵ In 1710, Aaron Hill was more philosophical, believing that 'the same variety of Humour and Morality now reigns in Turkey that is found in Christendom, and that the numerous Mahometans are like our selves divided into Good and Bad.' He felt that to describe them as being of 'spotless virtue' was as misleading as to believe them 'wholly sunk in dull stupidity'.⁶

Baron Charlemont, visiting in 1749, complained of the lack of communication between the Turks and the Franks. He was dismayed by the attitude of the British ambassador whose 'own connexions with Mussulmans were so very limited' that it was impossible for him to introduce Charlemont to 'some sensible Turk, unprejudiced and well informed'.⁷ The gulf between Turks and Franks was undoubtedly wide, and the language barriers made the task of mutual understanding more difficult for both sides. Kinnoull appears to have had a particular dislike of the Greeks, whom he describes as 'the most despicable people under the sun' and much worse than the Turks.⁸

Occasionally, we find a Frank who comments on Turkish social customs with greater insight. Around 1697, the merchant Richard Chiswell observed that the Turkish social system was more fluid and less hierarchical than that of England: 'It is well known that there is no such thing as Families in Turkey'.⁹ Thus, a Turk of humble origins could rise to an important post in the Imperial bureaucracy through his own ability and without the help of a well-connected family. As Chiswell so

delightfully put it: 'If my Father was Garlic & my Mother was an Onion, I may be a Fine Flower.'¹⁰

The Turkish view of the Franks was fairly uncompromising. Strict Muslims had nothing but contempt for the 'giaours' or 'hogs', as Europeans were called: 'the opprobrious name of Gaur, Infidel, [was] bestow'd on all Christians; and Kiafir or Blasphemer.'¹¹ Other names were used too: the janissaries who were assigned to the Franks as guards became known as 'swineherds' and Pera as the 'pig quarter'.¹² These janissaries and the dragomans assigned to the palaces had to wear special clothes and yellow shoes to show their official status in the employ of Europeans, otherwise they risked being attacked by the local population for their association with the 'giaours'. The cost of purchasing these shoes appears frequently in the Levant Company accounts.

Most of the non-Turkish residents lived in Galata and Pera, sections of the city on the northern side of the Golden Horn, with views across to the Seraglio, 'showing an agreeable mixture of gardens, pine and cypress trees, palaces, mosques and public buildings, raised one above the other'.¹³ The ambassadors' palaces were mostly in Pera, on the hill above Galata and its harbour. A French map of 1790 marks areas of Pera by the names of the Frankish nations, such as 'Venis', 'Angleterre', 'Allemagne', 'Suede' and 'France', to indicate the sites of the embassies. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu wrote to a friend: 'One part of our house shows us the port, the city, the seraglio, and the distant hills of Asia; perhaps, all together, the most beautiful prospect in the world.'¹⁴ In the late 1600s Evliyá Chelebí describes life in these neighbourhoods thus:

In Galata there are eighteen wards inhabited by Moslems, seventy by Greeks, three by Franks, one by Jews, and two by Armenians. ... The Infidels possess seventy churches. ... The different wards of the town are patrolled day and night by watchmen to prevent disorder among the population who are of a rebellious disposition. ... There are two hundred taverns and wine booths where the infidels divert themselves with music and drinking. ... When I passed through this district I saw many hundred, bareheaded and barefoot, lying drunk in the street. ... The Greeks keep the taverns; most of the Armenians are merchants or money-changers; the Jews are the go-betweens in amorous intrigues. ... The fair sex of this town are celebrated. The inhabitants possess something of the nature of dervishes and in winter-time entertain good company.¹⁵

The Greeks formed one of the largest non-Turkish communities and Medley observes that 'tis S^d there is above thirty Greek Churches In the city' (26 February 1735). The Greek community was mainly concentrated in the area near the lighthouse (phanarion in Greek) on the Golden Horn; hence they were known as Phanariot Greeks.

Galata was quite unlike the old town of Constantinople, mainly because of the concentration of Europeans living there. There were restrictions on infidels building houses or living near mosques so it was inevitable that they would congregate in one particular area away from the centre of the city. For devout Muslims drinking was banned, but in Galata Turks and others could buy alcohol at the many taverns that existed. Samuel Medley mentions visiting one such on several occasions: '(22 October 1733) I walked wth Dr Smith & J German to Galleta ... was wth y^m allso at Jackoos Taverem afternoon.'¹⁶

There seems to have been an ambivalent attitude by Muslims to drinking alcohol. Upper class members of society were ready to drink it in moderation in private; when Mehmed Effendi went to Paris in 1721 as the Turkish ambassador, he drank occasionally but never in public.¹⁷ The effendi Achmet Bey told Lady Mary Wortley Montagu that 'the prohibition of wine was a very wise maxim, and meant for the common people being the source of all disorders among them; but that the prophet never designed to confine those that knew how to use it with moderation.'¹⁸

Pera, where most of the embassies were situated, had many open spaces including Turkish, Armenian and Christian 'burying grounds' or cemeteries. It was the custom of the Turks and Armenians to plant flowers and trees among the tombstones, and the Franks would assemble of an evening to stroll in one particular graveyard in Pera with views over the Golden Horn. Samuel Medley makes frequent reference to walks that he took to these cemeteries, either on his own or with several companions: '(9 April 1734) I walked afternoon wth Dr Smith to Bobbys & to y^e Buring ground – no company today;' '(12 April 1735) I walked alone to y^e English – to y^e Armenian – & Turks buriing ground in the Morning.'

Water was essential to a large city like Constantinople, which was supplied by several large aqueducts to the north, some of which dated back to the time of Constantine, and by vast underground cisterns. As well as the aqueducts, there were many 'bendts' or artificial reservoirs in the area to the north of Pera, with one large bendt in the forest near Belgrade village, which the Franks frequently visited. Another feature was the large number of public fountains, often built by private individuals as

an act of charity. Medley frequently mentions the one at Belgrade village and often walked there with his friends: '(19 July 1734) Friday – I walked to y^e fountain & B[owling] Green twice & Round on y^e Comon Evening.' While still at Belgrade he notes rather mysteriously (and in fact we never hear of this fountain again): '(8 September 1734) ... this day the fountain was Hedged up by the Turks.' Medley was clearly interested in a Turkish custom relating to the use of water:

Opposite 27 December 1734

Ob[servatio]n in Constantinople & pera viz y^e other side of the Citty there are Several men walk about the Streets wth water In Large Leather Bagg^s w^{ch} hang about their neck & come under one of their armes In a pipe and are oblig'd to Give any poor person or others water that ask for it – the Reson or cause of this (I have ben Credably Inform'd) Is a fund of Charaty that has ben Left for y^e Reliefe of people in the Streets – But there is no Less (wee are told) than 26 fountains made in the Streets Since wee Came here; w^{ch} I Beleive is true – So that there is not that nesary for watter as formerly – But the fund being Settled by Severall persons it is Continued – ob-n If they offer their cupp (w^{ch} Is Copper linnd) about a pint – if it be any one of fashon – they Expect you give then a peraw w^{ch} is a peny and this is one kind of way of Begging.

HOUSES AND 'PALACES'

During the early eighteenth century 'the embassies were built "*alla turca*" in wood, with a large upper reception hall or sofa off which other rooms opened.'¹⁹ The rooms were divided into men's and women's quarters, in accordance with Turkish custom. Each embassy had its chapel – the fact that Calkoen, the Dutch ambassador, had a stone chapel in his compound was particularly remarked on. There were also other embassy buildings including stables, storerooms and bakehouses. Furnishings in the British palace were in European style and included many hangings of linen, silk and damask as well as beds, chairs, presses, tables, china and cutlery. All these were detailed in an inventory of items lost or destroyed in the 1726 fire at the British embassy.²⁰ A sedan chair that had been broken to pieces was 'lined with velvet embroidered with silk and the outside finely painted'. The amount of wine destroyed or stolen was considerable: 'four hundred meters of Alogna wine' (value 400 dollars), 'six hundred meters of red wine made in the Palace' (value 600 dollars), 'Seven Chests of

Brandy' (value 60 dollars), as well as champagne, Burgundy, Hungarian, Cyprus and other foreign wines worth 330 dollars.²¹

William Sandys, the *Cancellier*, auctioned all the goods in his embassy apartment before returning to England in 1731. These included his clothes, the furnishings (hangings, a sofa, chairs, a bureau, his books, 'one camp bed with 3 mattresses', blankets and a quilt from his wife's bed-chamber) and in the cancellaria a large table, a press and some curtains. The auction raised £694 to repay a debt of £200, with the residue presumably going to his wife Mrs Ann Sandys.²² There were many such auctions of people's household goods when they died or left Constantinople; Samuel Medley records having made several purchases at auction, including handkerchiefs and hose.

It does not appear, therefore, that the English incorporated any features of Turkish furnishing in their embassy; similarly, the French had the equivalent of a throne room in their palace, lined with portraits of the kings of France.²³ The local carpets, sofas and marble fountains so beloved by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu found no place here, but paintings by Jean Baptiste Vanmour, many of whose works are now in the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, show what contemporary Turkish interiors would have looked like.

Vanmour had gone to Constantinople with the French ambassador de Ferriol in 1699 and was later employed by the Dutch ambassador Cornelius Calkoen to produce a number of works. His paintings of life in Constantinople at this time are invaluable, showing receptions of ambassadors at the Turkish court, costumes worn by the sultans and other important Turkish officials, views of the city and domestic scenes such as a Greek wedding or a Turkish nursery.²⁴ What made Vanmour's work even more important was the fact that when de Ferriol returned to Paris, he had a series of engravings made from a hundred of Vanmour's paintings in the *Recueil de cent estampes qui representant les differentes nations du Levant*, first published in Paris in 1712. This work established Vanmour's reputation and 'became a major source of visual information about Turkish customs and costumes for people in western Europe'.²⁵ Unfortunately, so far as we know, no member of any British embassy was painted by Vanmour, other than Lady Mary Wortley Montagu.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

Constantinople was not the most desirable place to live for health and safety reasons. Dangers were ever present: a traditional saying declared

that ‘*In Pera sono tre malanni: peste, fuoco, dragomanni*’ (the three perils in Pera were plague, fire and interpreters).²⁶ The Turkish government was somewhat unstable, and riots and rebellions were fairly frequent. After the 1730 revolt many thousands were killed: ‘The Bosphorus was continually covered with Cadavars, agitated at the Pleasure of Winds and Waves,’ something that must have been very unpleasant for all concerned.²⁷ Earthquakes occurred too, as Samuel Medley often recorded, although he does not report any loss of life: (Tuesday 24 June 1735) ‘This Morning about 2 a Clock there was a terrable Shock by an Earthquake.’

Plague was indeed a very serious problem, one Medley frequently mentioned. Sometimes it was not possible to escape immediately to Belgrade village, a country retreat where many of the ambassadors had houses,²⁸ in which case alternative plans for self-preservation were needed: (22 July 1735) ‘My Ld Dind at 2 – no viziters – now the Gates Cloos Shutt – as is many other palaces on acc^t of the Increaseing of the pest Lord preserve us & keep us all.’ This was during an exceptionally hot period, but there are also reports of plague in the winter months, in Belgrade as well as the capital. In January 1733 Kinnoull writes to Delafaye that the Grand Vizier has lost 700 of his household to the plague, and he tells Robinson:

We have had a raging plague for above seven months ... which has swept away incredible numbers of people of all ranks, and great numbers in the Frank Quarters of Pera and Galata. I lost a Greek under-Butler his wife and three children – poor people by their own folly. But by God’s great goodness there was no other accident in the family.²⁹

Some interesting remedies for the plague were recorded. For instance, M. de Guys reports that during one outbreak:

The Greek women at Constantinople who attend the sick, never require any thing but brandy to keep it off: of which they drink often in the course of the day. ... Several of the domestics of M. le Comte de Bonneval, being seized with the plague, he directed the same remedy to be administered them, which is usually given, in France, to horses attacked with the *farcy* (otherwise known as Glanders), proportioning the quantity to the patients, and many of them recovered.³⁰

The Levant Company, Kinnoull's employer, recognized the dangers to health to the extent that it paid regularly towards the maintenance of 'an Hospitall for the reception of His Excellency's and the Nation's servants in case of sickness'.³¹ Medley does not, however, record any use being made of this facility. Kinnoull was ill from time to time during his time in Constantinople. In August 1730 he complains of much ill-health since arrival but is better in the country air of Belgrade village.³² Later, during the last three months of 1732, he suffered from 'fever and ague' and said that he had not been visiting, but that the Frank ministers had come to see him.³³ By mid-January 1733 he was improving 'By keeping myself in a warm room and clothing myself in furr'.³⁴

Fires were another hazard of life, taking hold easily among the wooden houses. Kinnoull reports a fire at Galata on 10 July³⁵ 1731, burning from 2 a.m. to 3 p.m., which burnt down three-quarters of the city. It was south of Pera, fortunately for the English embassy, and the 'magasines' where the Europeans stored their trade goods in Galata were strongly built in stone and so mostly survived. The Grand Signor and the Grand Vizier came over with janissaries to help fight the blaze, as was traditional in Constantinople, but the janissaries broke into the local merchants' wine cellars and got drunk!³⁶ Samuel Medley records many fires, such as:

18 January 1734

Much More Snow & very keen frost – as has ben known in this Country – a very Great fire in Constantinople – Last Night – w^{ch} Burnt Down the old pallace of one of the former Sultans where the Seni Reusefendy an old man livd- the vizirs daughter Lay in at that time: & was caried out in her Bed.

15 February 1734

a Great fire In y^e fish market In the night – at Stamboll.

5 March 1734

a Great fire at Constantinople & a Great fire at Scutary In asia.

13 November 1734

a fire In the Grand Serallio about 10 at night.

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

26 February 1735

two fires Last night in Stamboll – and Greek new built church there
Burnt down.

31 March 1735

a fire this day at Stamboll 25 houses Burnt.

Opposite 10 July 1735

on the 10th towards moring was seen a Great Body of fire – w^{ch} Broke
In two – toward the G Seraglio – In appearance.

17 August 1735

great fires Last night and this morning – at Stambol – & at 2 other
Places on this Side the water.

Interestingly, the first mention of fire engines in Constantinople occurs during this period. Calkoen, the Dutch ambassador, brought some fire engines with him in 1727 at the request of the Turkish court, very welcome equipment in a city where fires were so frequent and so dangerous.³⁷ One of the reasons for the prevalence of fires was a method of heating used inside the wooden houses in the winter months. Hot ashes were placed under a small table or tandur, which would then be covered with a quilt to keep the heat in. Any carelessness could be disastrous: ‘At this table they [the Turks] work, read and very often sleep; and, if they chance to dream, kick down the tendour, and the hot ashes commonly set the house on fire.’³⁸

THE WEATHER AND OTHER NATURAL PHENOMENA

As regards climate, Kinnoull says ‘the winters are ten times worse than in England’; ‘it is almost impossible to protect oneself from the cold in these paper houses.’ May and the autumn are changeable and can be cold, but from May to November it is ‘the most delightful climate’.³⁹ Nevertheless, Samuel Medley is reporting, by 19 October, in 1733: ‘Keen frosty morning wth snow’.

The weather is a constant topic in Medley’s diary. A few of the more interesting examples will suffice. On 21 January 1734: ‘The frost Continues very hard My L^d Dind In the Evening – we heard this day 4 persons was Lost in the Snow – 2 days agoe – there was never So Much Snow – & So Long a time of Bad weather – In the Memory of any Body

living.’ However, two days later, on 23 January, ‘the frost is Gon & y^e Snow is goeing.’ The temperatures went to the other extreme in June and July of 1735, with much thunder and lightning. On 10 July 1735 ‘the Season was never known to be Hotter’ and on 14 July 1735 it was a ‘very very very Hot time’. Rain could also be a problem. The early part of December 1733 was such a time: ‘8th Saturday – a verry unpleasant unwholesom Could Raney windy time’.

Sometimes there were unexplained phenomena. Opposite 6 September 1734, but perhaps recorded later, is written:

about this time or some days before I hear viz the Beginning – of Sepr: about 10 at night apeard a Great Gloob of fire & Round in the air from the W or South West & Burst near Constantinople (as apeard to allmost Every one – after w^{ch} a mighty Crack of thunder – this phenomanon was Seen wth Most of our famaly here at Bellgrade vilage w^{ch} is 14 or 15 miles from the City of Stamboll – the thunder Crack awakened me – I being in Bed But the flash of that Great light I did not Se being asleep – the famaly at pera that was up all Se it wth great Surprise & astonishment.

Strangely enough, another person recorded this or a similar event in September 1734. In a letter home the Dutch ambassador Calkoen described a strange phenomenon in the sky at 10 p.m. on 10 September. He saw a roundish ball giving out a bright fiery light that passed in front of the moon, obscuring its light; this was followed by a very loud noise, worse than thunder, and more like 100 cannon going off together.⁴⁰

BELGRADE VILLAGE

The Franks made great use of the pleasant wooded countryside immediately to the north of Pera as a retreat, especially a small village called Belgrade, which was about three hours’ ride away, or ‘14 or 15 miles from the City of Stamboul’.⁴¹ Transport would be on horseback, in an arraba or cart, or in a sedan chair, as Samuel Medley often mentions. There they had houses where they could get away from the heat of the city in the summer, or escape the worst ravages of the plague in a place that ‘perfectly answers the description of the Elysian fields.’⁴²

Life appears to have been more relaxed away from the city, and Medley gives details of walks, rides, games, shooting expeditions and other diversions. Bird catching – what kind of birds or for what purpose

is not specified – was popular one particular autumn. On 23 September 1734 ‘I walked to Sr Luckas vineyard in y^e morning & Se the 2 Leasters catch Birds viz 103’ and on 25 September 1734, ‘I walked in y^e Morning & allso in the Evening to y^e topp of my Lords Ground to Se y^e Bird catching again.’ Medley and his friends made several more excursions that week to the ‘birding place’.

Excursions were also made northwards to Ovid’s Tower, or across the Bosphorus to the Asian side. The upper reaches of the Golden Horn, known as the Sweet Waters of Europe, were very popular, both with Turks and Franks. It was here on the north bank of the Golden Horn that in 1722 the Grand Vizier had built for Sultan Ahmet III the pleasure palace called Sa’adabad, or Eternal Happiness, with its gardens planted in the style of Versailles. There were fountains, marble basins, cascades and kiosks, with many of the wooden buildings painted bright colours. Europeans visited the area frequently, and Samuel Medley mentions expeditions to the Grand Signor’s ‘Keeosk’ for fishing or just for pleasure.

The English merchants were often at Belgrade as well, and Mr Payne the chaplain would say prayers in the dining room on Sundays before the usual dinner given by Kinnoull.

The Kinnoull entourage was usually in Belgrade in the hot summer months, and Calkoen, the Dutch ambassador, Villeneuve, the French ambassador, Thalmann, the Imperial Resident and Count Stadnicki, the Pole, also had houses here or at nearby ‘Buctree’ (Buyukdere). Medley gives details of the frequent gatherings that took place, sometimes in the village, sometimes elsewhere, and we shall meet the various characters involved in subsequent chapters. For example, on 20 May 1734, ‘His Ex[cellenc]y Count Kininsky – Barron Hoppkins B[aron] Zy Mr Carlson &c. Dind at the Gd Senirs Keeosk – I was there in waiting’ and then, on 5 August 1734, ‘Mr Tallman the Inperial Resident – the two Moscovite Residents – &c. – Dind wth his Ex-y – Dr Theodose Mr Morage & y^e architect came here Evening – I walked wth Mr Matth to y^e other village – & to Count Kininskys there.’

Sometimes the Grand Signor passed by the village. On 12 July 1731, ‘refreshments of Sweetmeats, Sherbets etc’ were sent to him during his visit to the nearby aqueducts. The Levant Company paid for this, and also for ‘china plates, and glasses, broke and kept by the Turks upon said occasion’.⁴³

EXCURSIONS

The ambassadors do not seem to have visited the main part of Constantinople very often. When they first arrived, they went in great state to receptions the Grand Vizier held at his palace and the Sultan in the Seraglio. Samuel Medley and other observers have described these visits in detail and there are oil paintings by Vanmour to set the scene. Prestige was involved here, so many attendants went too, dressed in their best livery; this was an extra for which the Levant Company was prepared to pay.⁴⁴ There were other formal visits, for instance on the installing of a new grand vizier, but on the whole the ambassadors spent their time in Pera or Belgrade, often visiting and dining in each other's company.

Expeditions of a 'tourist' nature were made occasionally. Samuel Medley crossed over to Constantinople with the ambassador's party to see the sights on 13 April 1734:

His Ex[cellenc]y M[ada]m Mrs S[and]ys Mrs Cl[ar]k – y^c 2 Sw[edish] Gentⁿ Mr Monere Mr Lyle Jnr – & Most of us of the Retinue of my Ld past over to Constantinople Erly in the morning – to Se the famous Moskee Calld St Sophia & a very Surprising Building It is – we also went to y^c Moskee Calld Sulltan accmet – the Lyons tigers & other wilde beasts – allso was at the attmedon – a very Large place where they Ride & Sell Horses – all wth in y^c City – wher is the Surprizing obelisk – the Serpentine Brass Pillar – & y^c old High Pillar.⁴⁵

And, on the opposite page:

Ob–n that no Cupoloes – (tho ther is many here) is to be covered wth Lead – Except the moskees – Some of which have 50 or 60 or more – & those Hire [i.e. higher] buildings belonging allso to the Gd Seigniors palaces &c. memdm – there is a vault on one Syde of St Sophia where most of the Sulltans are Interd – & in another vault – near this Is Sulltan Sellim – Interd – wth his 120 Children – the Monuments are poor – or Rather not to be calld so at all.

Medley mentions a book, useful to the intelligent tourist, called '*The antiquities of Constantinople* by J^{no}. Ball formerly of CCC in Oxon 1729'. In fact, it is by Pierre Gilles of Albi and Ball is the translator. It is

interesting that this work was already available for Medley to read in Constantinople by February 1734, the date of his diary entry.

Another 'tourist' activity popular with the Franks was to watch the grand signor go to Santa Sophia for prayers on a Friday. Lord Charlemont gives a detailed description of the event, noting the splendour of the robes and horses of the 'grand Turks' but unfortunately Medley is, as ever, much briefer. On 2 May 1734:

His Ex-y – the 2 Sweeds Gentⁿ & many of of us of my L^d
Retinue – went Stambol Erly in y^e morning viz by 3 a clock – to
Se the Grand Senr pas in grand Show to St Sophia Moskee – &
after that fine show – wee went by boats to Sattabat & Returnd
by watter towards Evening a very fine Spasa [excursion].

Then, nearly a year later, on 22 April 1735, 'His Ex-y – m[ada]m – & many of the Retinue went very Erly – to Stambol – to Se the Grand Ser Goe to St Sophia – being the Begining of the little Bayram.' The Little Bayram festival (*Eis-ul-Adhia*) was held about two months after the Great Byram (*Eid-ul-Fitr*) that marked the end of Ramadan.

By this period it seems that it was acceptable for Europeans to wear their usual clothing in large centres like Constantinople. Earlier on it had been wise to dress in the Turkish fashion to avoid undue attention in the streets. Whenever an ambassador went out, he was accompanied by his janissaries who could protect him against any insults from the Turks. Wood believed that Europeans were 'liable to be beaten, pelted and insulted in the streets without giving the slightest provocation'.⁴⁶ However, Samuel Medley frequently walked about both in Pera and in Constantinople itself 'aloon', that is, on his own; he makes a point of reporting this and never mentions having encountered any difficulties. For example, on Wednesday 9 April 1735, on a 'very cold Morning I walked to Topena & to Galletta & Return'd by the white tower – aloon – in the forenoon – a Strong north East wind.' Again, on 21 May 1735, 'I walked alone to Stamboll and from thence to y^e Ballook bazar – & then to topena and by the Sraglio Returnd by 11 a clock.'

It is of course true that a Frankish servant would be less conspicuous than an ambassador, and on some occasions he went in the company of one or more friends.⁴⁷ On security in Constantinople in the evening, however, he remarks (opposite 9 April 1734) 'that there is no body walketh the Streets of Constantinople after it is dark Except the watch

wch thy [they] call the Guard here.’ There were occasions when he knew a janissary escort was necessary for security reasons, for instance when several carts of provisions had to be taken to Belgrade. The same was true of a shopping expedition to Constantinople. On 24 December 1734 ‘I went wth Mr Brown & one of our Janesaries to Stamboll where Many things ... was bought for his Ex-ys use.’ Others were also cautious. César de Saussure, the Swiss national who had travelled out with Kinnoull, went on a trip to the Dardenelles with two Englishmen in 1733, accompanied by two janissaries. He states firmly that ‘*les Francs ne voyagent jamais par terre en Turquie sans avoir un Janissary avec eux, crainte d’etre insulté par quelques canailles.*’⁴⁸

TURKISH CUSTOMS AND HABITS

Samuel Medley makes a few observations on Turkish life, mostly without any comment or opinion of his own. For instance, opposite the 24 June 1734 entry, he observes that ‘the Turks Dine at (our) 11 a Clock goe to bed betime & Rise verry Erly.’ Later, opposite the 22 February 1735 entry, ‘wee hear from Stamboll – that Severall prophets (turks) haveing prophesied yt the world is to be at an End – this year The Grand Senior – has put them all in prison – telling y^m that they know thay cant be above a year Confind according to their knowledge.’ Yet again, opposite the 24 June 1734 entry, he notes ‘Bellgrade village Midsummerday – their way (here) to finde out a theife by Eating a peice of Bread.’ This last observation is intriguing. ‘In the Spanish inquisition the accused was told to swallow bread and cheese, and those in whom the bolus stuck in the gullet were marked as guilty.’⁴⁹ Patricia Martin⁵⁰ mentions similar tests in the Middle Ages involving dry bread, a Chinese equivalent involving dry rice flour and an Arab Bedouin test involving making the accused lick a hot iron: the tongue would be burnt if a guilty (or nervous!) candidate failed to produce enough saliva.

Medley had no time for inoculation against smallpox, something that Lady Mary Wortley Montagu had espoused to such an extent that she allowed her three-year-old to be inoculated without any harmful results. Medley’s view is uncompromisingly conservative on the matter, as is evident opposite the entry for 28 March 1735:

of Inoculating – In the Smale Pox

The Doctrins of the Bowstring, and of Inoculating in the Smalepox – are both of Mahometan original, & can never Suit wth a free born

English Constitution: – they are a Sort of tax upon our Bodies, Contrary to the Laws of nature, & of providence.



That y^e wild whim of Inoculating Should prevail in G Britain is wonderfully to be wondered at:- tis S^d many Learned & ma[n]ly noble have Come into it But if all Such were for it; if it not be Lawfull – that wod not Justifie or Excuse the Practice –



Wod not he be Laugh'd at that Should pull out a Sound tooth – for fear it Should ake or to be Rotten hereafter – or wod these Gentlemen if the plague was amongst us Inoculate for that – I believe they wod not tho the Reasons the Same –



How can we pray for a Blessing on y^e means for our Recovery out of y^t Condition – whereinto we have willfully & on Set purpose Brought our selves – tis one thing to trust providence & another thing to tempt it –

On religion he has more to say. On 18 April 1734 he says ‘that the Prostrations – w^{ch} the turks – make in their prayers – are taken from the Jews Custome – wⁿ Solomon Dedicatced the temple – Cron 2^d – Chapr 7 vers 3^d.’ The relevant verse, in the authorized version, which he would have read, is: ‘And when all the children of Israel saw how the fire came down, and the glory of the Lord upon the house, they bowed themselves with their faces to the ground upon the pavement, and worshipped and praised the Lord.’

Towards the end of the diary he becomes more interested in Islam, with an entry opposite 22 September 1736 entitled:

*Some observations I have Made that the
Turks Relegion & Pollitics ar mostly taken from the Jews*

1st the Despotic power – In Executing wth out Jury advocats &c. – as did the Kings of Israel – Let one of y^e young men fall upon him.

2^d they once Every year on a Certain day Sacrafice a Sheep – Even Every man that married or is a housekeeper Servant or Labourer &c.

3^d they all weare Girdles – Men women & Childeren.

4th they wash Before – & after worship too – the poor wash their hands face & feet – & the others have Bagneos [baths].

5th They Deny that Jesus Christ Is Come in the flesh – for the Redemption of Man Kinde.

6th They will not Suffer the women to worship in the Same place in the Moskee (or Church) – the men by themselves & the women by themselves.

7th they have their feast of weeks & feast of Tabernacles – w^{ch} they Call – the Byram & Ramesan.

8th they worship no Images nor Pictures.

9th They will not Eat Swines flesh

They have pluralaty of wives – they viz the Turks are Licenc'd – (wether by Law Custom or the present Conivance of the Government – I do not yet know) to have 4 wives – & as many Slaves as they Can or – like to purchase.

they have a Certain perticular worship at the apearence of Every new moon

In fact, Medley's observations here are not all reliable, although it is of course true that Islam and Christianity have inherited many of their most important beliefs, customs and institutions from Judaism: Nos. 4, 6, 8, 9 are fair comment, although ritual ablutions are undertaken before, rather than after worship. No. 1 does not represent Judaism generally but is an isolated example from a particular historical period – despotic power has little to do with any particular religion. In relation to No. 2, 'Muslims who can afford to do so, slaughter an animal to commemorate [the] act of devotion' in the Abraham/Isaac story. The person making the sacrifice can eat some and distributes the rest to relations, friends and the poor.⁵¹ No. 3 is something of a generalization. No. 5 is true (without the dash) but can be said of any non-Christian. No. 7 is not true; the Jewish festivals he mentions are not equivalent either to the Little Bayram (*Eid-ul-Adha*) or the Great Bayram (*Eid-ul-Fitr*) or to Ramadan of which *Eid-ul-Fitr* marks the end. Medley is confused over these matters though it is of interest that he is searching for parallels. As regards polygamy, this was not a Jewish tradition. Medley makes no particular judgements on these matters and of course we do not know to what extent we are being given the results of his personal observations, rather than the fruits of his reading.

By this time, Relandus had cleared up most of the major misconceptions about Islam in *De Religione Mohammedica libri duo*,⁵² for those who read him, but, on the other hand, Prideaux's *The true nature of imposture fully display'd in the life of Mahomet*,⁵³ of which there were many editions at the beginning of the eighteenth century, had had considerable sales and was full of scurrilous attacks on Islam and huge misrepresentations.

Medley does not note the positive fact that the Turks neither routinely indulged in persecuting Christians or Jews nor forced many conversions to Islam; even the *devshirme* or capture of Christian boys from other parts of the Ottoman Empire and their conversion to Islam had fallen into disuse by this time. He only becomes sufficiently upset to make judgements on religious matters when he encounters what he calls 'strange ragg's of popery',⁵⁴ for example at a Roman Catholic funeral or at the chapel in the French embassy.

One other local religious practice did catch his eye. On 16 October 1733 'I went (afternoon) with Mr Matth & Dr Smith to se the preaching & Strang Mad Enthusicall worship of a Sect of Turks Calld Derviches' and, on 24 February 1736 'Tuesday I went wth Mr Jones to se the dervices worship.' This was the Mevlevi order of dervishes, and Medley was not the only visitor to comment on their customs. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu went to one of their monasteries or '*tekke*' to see their dancing, as did Lord Charlemont and his party, assembling in a large hall with a crowd of Turks, including women who were allowed to be present if heavily veiled. The whole ceremony lasted about two hours, during which time the monks whirled round at a rate that Charlemont reckoned to exceed 60 revolutions a minute. 'This painful exercise was continued for a considerable time, until at length the music ceased, and they stopped seemingly undisturbed by giddiness, and thus the ceremony ended.'⁵⁵

EUROPEAN WOMEN IN CONSTANTINOPLE
IN THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Samuel Medley makes very few observations about European women living in Constantinople in the 1730s. It must have been a very difficult life for them in many ways, given the restrictions Turkish society placed on women appearing at public events or participating with men in social events outside the confines of the home. There would have been deep anxieties about the plague and the frequency of fires, as well as concerns about young children and a desperate feeling of being cut off from home and family.

Communication with servants and local people would have been a problem. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu described the multiplicity of languages spoken in Pera. 'I live in a place that very well represents the tower of Babel. ... My grooms are Arabs; my footmen French, English, and Germans; my nurse, an Armenian; my housemaids, Russians; half-a-dozen other servants, Greeks: my steward, an Italian; my janissaries, Turks.'⁵⁶

Abraham Stanyan, Kinnoull's predecessor, mentions to Newcastle in a letter that his wife had visited Constantinople, passing 'through Vienna on her way hither'.⁵⁷ It seems unlikely she was there all the time since Kinnoull reports thus on Stanyan: he was 'a well-behaved, complaisant gentleman of an indolent temper. ... His whole life here, for these 12 years past, as I am informed, has been upon a Sofa with the women.'⁵⁸

Lady Kinnoull remained in England, looking after the family; their eldest son, Viscount Dupplin, accompanied his father to Constantinople in 1729⁵⁹ but was back in England by 1731. There is no record of any other members of the family visiting Constantinople. By contrast, when Villeneuve left France in 1728 to take up his post as ambassador to the Sublime Porte, he was accompanied by his wife, children and two of his brothers.⁶⁰ Villeneuve's daughter later left to return to Europe; on 20 July 1735 Medley records that 'Mr Tobin did not goe till yesterday – wñ we Se him & the french ambrs daughter – Sayle by the poynt – wñ wee were on Board the Tigress.'

In the absence of his wife, it seems that Kinnoull had a gentlewoman housekeeper whom Medley knew as 'Madam' and treated with great respect. This lady went out and about in public with Kinnoull and other Europeans but does not seem to have participated in formal embassy entertainments such as the occasion when Villeneuve and his wife were guests at 'a very sumptuous diner', which Kinnoull provided on 3 June 1734. Her precise role in his household was, however, open to speculation, as we shall see. Indeed, the Dutch ambassador claimed, whether out of malice or genuine belief, that she was Kinnoull's mistress.

Medley records an annual New Year custom at which ladies were present. On Monday 31 December 1733 he writes:

all the Gentlemen & others – under my L^{ds} protection Come to pay a vizit to his Ex-y – and all the officers of all the pallaces – as is the Custom here to wish my Ld a Happy new year – all Ladys & Gentlewomen allsoe do the same – & 3 orders p[ro]p[ri]e h[er] priests.

The embassy community or ‘family’ also included wives of some employees, such as Mrs Sandys, wife of Kinnoull’s secretary William Sandys, Mrs Clark, wife of his steward, and some female servants, such as local Greek women. Medley makes several mentions of the Misses Savage and their elderly mother who attended the embassy chapel on occasion, but we have no further information about them.

Levant Company records show that Mr Thalmann, the Austrian envoy, married Elizabeth, the daughter of a Mr Constantine, a long-standing member of the English merchant community in Constantinople. Medley notes that the couple had a baby son on 6 January 1734, but sadly the child died nine days later.

Kinnoull mentions one redoubtable woman visitor, Lady Gerard. In September 1730, he writes: ‘The Lady Gerard of Bromley came here from Vienna last February in her way to Jerusalem whither she says she is going out of devotion ... she’s an old lady past sixty and I’m afraid a little whimsical.’⁶¹ Four months later he reports that Lady Gerard has gone to Joppa and he is doing everything necessary for her,⁶² but four months after that he hears that she has died of a fever there, Monsieur l’Abbe and her chaplain Mr Watts being with her.⁶³

Medley says nothing about relations between the Frankish women he encountered and the local population. It is unlikely that any of the European women he knew were as bold as Lady Mary Wortley Montagu whose letters about her Turkish experiences caused much discussion when they were finally published in 1763. She explored Constantinople frequently, going across the water from Galata dressed in an appropriate manner: ‘I ramble every day, wrapped up in my ferigée and asmáck, about Constantinople, and amuse myself with seeing all that is curious in it.’⁶⁴ There she visited baths, palaces and mosques, such as Santa Sophia, but even she was unable to enter the Sultan’s harem in the Seraglio. It is unclear whether she went alone on her rambles or whether she was accompanied by a janissary or other employee from the embassy. Lady Mary had little patience with European women who would not conform to accepted local dress codes and therefore never crossed the water to Constantinople; ‘the French ambassadress will return to France (I believe) without ever having been there.’⁶⁵

Villeneuve, the French ambassador in Kinnoull’s time, did describe a highly unconventional meeting that took place between his wife and a senior Turkish official. In a letter of 18 March 1736 Villeneuve explains that he was by his fireside, ‘*en robe de chambre*’, when he learnt that the

Kaptan Pasha (or admiral of the fleet) was approaching. Dressing hastily, Villeneuve went down to the quayside only to be told that the Kaptan Pasha was already in the French palace with the ambassadress, '*seule e sans drogman*'. Villeneuve found Djanum Khodja in excellent spirits, saying he had been better entertained by Madame de Villeneuve than by her husband and that the purpose of his visit had been to meet her. He stayed for an hour and a half, addressing his hosts in an '*italien corrompu*'; he was given the traditional hospitality of coffee, sweetmeats, orange water to wash his hands and perfume for his beard. Madame de Villeneuve also gave him gifts on his departure, including a gold watch. Villeneuve was amused by the stir this visit would have caused since an unannounced public visit to an ambassador by such an important Turk was almost unheard of. In addition, it must have been very unusual for a European woman to receive a Turk on her own in this way. Apparently, Djanum did not mention politics during his visit, but several days later the Dragoman of the Porte visited Villeneuve to try and find out the French attitude to the likelihood of an Ottoman war with Russia.⁶⁶ So it was not merely a social call after all.

This then was the background against which Kinnoull played out his role as ambassador, and against which Samuel Medley kept his diary. Although Medley's diary entries are often tantalizingly brief, they help in an understanding of how the British embassy staff lived in Constantinople during the early part of the eighteenth century.

3

The New Ambassador Makes a Start

INTRODUCTIONS

LORD KINNOULL brought with him, to Constantinople, a letter, dated 26 September 1729, to his predecessor, Abraham Stanyan, from the ‘most affectionate friends and humble servants, the Governor and Company of Merchants of England Trading into the Levant Seas’:

This is chiefly to accompany ... the Earl of Kinnoull who is now ready to proceed to Constantinople. ... We desire Your Lordship will please to communicate to His excellency. ... What methods and conduct Your Lordship’s wisdom and experience shall have found most conducive to our Interests and Beneficial to our Affairs there.¹

Thus, as well as being primed, by Stanyan, about the King’s business, the other ambassadors, the protocol of the Ottoman court, the niceties of local customs and culture, the living conditions, health and safety problems, the unreliability and infrequency of communications, the inadequacy of the finances, he will have learnt about the needs, wishes, ambitions and problems of the merchants of the Levant Company, his principal paymaster. It must have been a very steep learning curve for anyone, especially for one so lacking in diplomatic experience or experience of the Orient.

Kinnoull’s first letter home to the Secretary of State for the southern department, the Duke of Newcastle, is dated 4 May 1730.² Kinnoull is waiting for the end of the ‘Tulip feast’ and his first interview with the Grand Vizier to whom he will be giving a present of fruit and flowers as a

‘public mark of honour’. He has had a private conversation with the ‘Druggerman’ (dragoman, i.e. interpreter) of the Porte and he states that the Porte has a great hatred of Austria and Russia. He particularly notes: ‘I shall be sure to obey HM’s commands in cultivating a strict friendship and correspondence with the French and Dutch ambassadors.’

The interview with the Grand Vizier was achieved on 12 May.³ The novelty of everything Kinnoull saw and experienced must have impressed him deeply. We have an account of this visit written in the third person, probably by his secretary William Sandys who did not come away from the event empty-handed and was able to send to his correspondent at home, under-secretary Charles Delafaye, a handkerchief for Mrs Delafaye which ‘was given me at HE’s audience [with the] ... Grand Vizier’:⁴

May 12 at 10 o’Clock in the morning the Amb^r. attended by his Son the L^d. Visct. Dupplin, the Capt. of the Man of War the Merchants and the other Officers of His Majties. Ship Set out from the Palace. When his Exy. Came to the Seale of Tophana he found the Chiaous Bashi’s Barge waiting to Carry him which is an unusual mark of Civility – As His Excellency pass’d the Man of War he was Saluted with 21 Guns – His Excellency Landed at the Seale of Bahci Capuci where about fifty horses were prepared to Carry His Excellency & his Retinue to the Vizir’s Palace. His Excellency was Conducted into a Chiosk till his retinue ranged themselves. The Chiaous Bashi Came in to the Chiosk to wait upon his Excellency & Several Civilitys passed Between them.

Every thing being prepared the march began in the following Order Two & Two –

1. A Chamber of Janissarys Consisting of 50 with their proper Officers with their Caps of Ceremony
2. Forty Chiaouses with their Turbants of Ceremony
3. His Excellency Mr. Stanyan’s Janissarys with their Liverys and caps
4. His Excellency the Earl of Kinnoull’s Janissarys with their Liverys and caps
5. Mr. Stanyan’s Master of the Horse
6. His 3 Led Horses
7. His Excellency the Earl of Kinnoull’s Master of the Horses

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

8. His Excellency's 3 Led Horses with Turkish Furniture, another of His Excellency's Led Horses with a Frank Saddle and furniture
9. Mr. Stanyan's 12 footmen in the Company's Long Liverys
10. The Earl of Kinnoull's 18 footmen in the Company's Long Liverys
11. Mr Stanyan's Steward
12. His 12 footmen in Frank Liverys
13. His Excellency the Earl of Kinnoull's Steward
14. His 12 footmen in Frank Liverys
15. Mr. Stanyan's 4 officers in Blew Cloth trim'd with Silver
16. His Excellency's 8 officers in Scarlet Cloth with Silver Lace
17. Five Giovany di Lingua
18. Ten Honorary & actual Druggerman
19. The officers of the Chiaouses
20. The Chiaous Pashi
21. His Excellency the Earl of Kinnoull attended by 4 Heydukes & 4 Grooms in Long white Livrey
22. The Secretarys with His Majesty's Letter and the Cancellier
23. Lord Dupplin with 2 Grooms in white Livery
24. The Capt. and the Nation.⁵

The March went on in very good Order & the Chiaous Bashi continud to go before the Amb^r. to the great Surprize of the French & Dutch Ambassadors who had at their Audiences a Quarell with him upon his pretending the right hand of them, which was a Point he never yielded before to any Amb^r. and was a Sign that his Excellency was upon a very good foot with the Ministers of the Port.

His Excellency Dismounted at the Palace & at the Top of the Stairs was met by the Chiaouslar [?] Emini & the Druggerman of the Port & of the Vizir – The Vizir immediately entred the Room & as he passed by the Amb^r. Saluted him by bowing his head to which his Excellency answered – The Vizir Sat down upon a Sofa in the Corner of the Room & the Amb^r. upon a Stoole which was prepared for him. The Salumagassi made a prayer for the preservation of the Grand Signior & Grand Vizir which all the Agas &c. joynd in before the Ambassador began to Speak the Vizir told him he was Welcome.

His Excellency then made his Compliment and afterwards took the Letter which was in his Secretarys hands in a Bag of Gold Stuff & Delivered it to the Druggerman of the Port who gave it to the Vizir – The Vizir made a very civil answer to the Amb^r. telling him that he should be always ready to protect & assist the English, that he desired to Cultivate a friendship with His Excellency, who, being a man of Quality, he was Sure inherited all Virtues Natural to a Man of high Birth, often repeating Assurances of his friendship towards him.

The Vizir then made a Sign that all the Company Should be turnd out there only remaind His Excy. Lord Dupplin, The Secretarys Druggerman & the Capt. His Excellency presented Lord Dupplin the Sectrys. & the rest that rem'd in the Room to the Vizir. After some Conversation they brought His Excy. Sweet meets Coffee Sherbets & perfumes.

The rest of the Company were then Admitted into the Room & Caftans were distributed to the Ambassador, Lord Dupplin, & the rest of the retinue to the Number of Thirty.

The Vizir Likewise gave Handcachierfs to the Ambassador & Some of the Attendants

His Excellency then took Leave & returnd in the Same order. He Came to the Palace at Pera where a Dinner was prepared for all the Company And as His Excellency passd the Man of War he was Saluted a second time with 21 guns.

The Next Day His Excellency Sent the Usual presents to the Vizir, Reis Effendi & Chiaiah, and other Ministers of the Port.

Captain Vincent of the *Torrington* was still in Constantinople, waiting for Stanyan to return with him to England. He noted that while making the crossing, Kinnoull was 'attended with 43 boats. We saluted him with 21 guns and at his return with the same number.'⁶

During the period covered by his diary, Samuel Medley attended six such audiences as part of the retinue (though in what capacity he does not say) but never devotes more than two lines to the affair! No doubt he remembered chiefly all the waiting about, especially when an audience took place in the winter. On 19 January 1734 'His Ex-y went to the Grand vizir In Ceremoney wth a great Retinue – a very could Snow & stormy day – I was there – much fateaged.' Writing to Newcastle subsequently,⁷ Kinnoull commented that the Grand Vizier 'kept me

above an hour' and was very civil. There is a coded message to the effect that it is absolutely necessary to keep in with the Chief Aga who controls access to the Grand Vizier; also that the Grand Vizier has been in post for 13 years and so 'understands our [Franks'] affairs better than any of his predecessors'. He observes that 'the Grand Vizier is all things to all men'.

No doubt the special respect that the *Chiaous Bashi* and, in his welcome, the Grand Vizier accorded to Lord Kinnoull, apparently at least in part on account of his noble birth, will not have endeared him to the other ambassadors. Some of the Levant Company merchants had evidently already been on the lookout for reasons to snipe at him and they had written to Newcastle with the accusation concerning women on board the *Torrington* with him, which we have already seen in the section on *The journey out* in Chapter 1. It may well be that they were not happy with Kinnoull's appointment in the first place and were looking for an opportunity to discredit him from the start.

Stanyan had informed Newcastle, in a letter of 27 May, that Kinnoull would not get an interview with the Grand Signor until the janissaries' payday, it being normal practice to receive ambassadors then.⁸ The interview took place on 9 June and an account of it forms a continuation of the document quoted above in relation to the audience with the Grand Vizier: 'His Excellency Set out from the Palace at Pera at 3 o'Clock in the morning Lighted by flambau's and attended by the Same Company as at the Grand Vizir's Visit except Mr. Stanyan's Houshold.' Everything then proceeded as for the visit to the Grand Vizier except that, this time, the destination was the Seraglio:

His Excellency arriv'd at the Gate of the Seraglio Just as it was open where he ranged himself and his retinue to See the Ministers & Officers of the Port enterd with their Several retinues and Led Horses, The Grand Vizir & his Attendants coming Last. After the Vizir & his retinue had enter'd the Gate, His Excellency followd with his retinue in order – The Chiaous Bashi riding before him. At the entring of the Gate wee saw about 4000 janissarys who run with great rapidity to take the Pillow [pilau, a rice dish] that was prepared for them, on the Left hand were the Grand Signiors led Horses ranged in order to the Number of fifty.

His Excellency Dismounted at the Gate of the Second Court. He was carried by The Druggerman of the Port to a Seat to repose himself where having sat a Little while the Chiaous Bashi came

Dress'd in a Caftan to conduct him he had a Long Staff with a Silver head in his hand. At the entrance of the Second Court the Capidgilar Kiyassi Joynd the Chiaous Bashi and having a Long Staff of Same Sort, both beat the Ground alternately as they conducted the Amb^r. to the Hall of the Divan.

At the Same time that His Excellency enter'd at the Great door of the Divan The Grand Vizir enter'd into the Divan Hall at another Door And the Several Vizirs of the Bench who assist the Grand Vizir in the Divan continued Standing till the Ambassador Seated himself upon a Stool prepared for him.

So Soon as the Grand Vizir was Seated Several Compliments pass'd between His Excellency & him by the Druggerman of the Port And Likewise between His Excellency and the Captain Pashaw who Sat on the Vizirs right hand. They Brought His Excellency Water to wash himself in a Silver Basin and to the Vizir in one of Copper.

Five tables were Spread. at the first were the vizir & the Ambassador. At the Second the Captain Pashaw entertain'd Lord Dupplin & Captain Vincent. the Vizirs de Voute entertain'd the Secretary and several of the British Merchants. No body Dinned at the Kadileskers nor Defterdars Tables.

The Dinner was Short but they Serv'd a great number of Dishes which were taken away almost as Soon as they were Set on the Table. After Dinner they brought Water and perfumes again to his excellency.

The Kabledgilar Kiyassi & Chiaous Bashi then came & Conducted the Ambassador into the Court under an Arch where Several of the Grand signiors Horses in Turkish Mountings adorn'd with Pearles were Show'd to His Excellency.

They then gave a Caftan to the Ambassador & distributed Several to his retinue after which His Excellency enter'd into the Grand Signior's Audience Room Supported by two Capidgi Bashis follow'd by the Druggerman of the Port, His Secretary who carried the Kings Letter, & Six other Persons, who were each of them Likewise Supported by two Capidgi Bashis. The Grand Signior was Seated upon the Steps of a Sort of a Throne with a canopy over it. Five Princes his Sons Stood at the foot of the Throne. The Grand Vizir was Standing over against the Grand Signior. And at Some distance five other Vizirs who were at the Divan.

His Excellency made his Speech & then took the Kings Letter from his secretary which he deliverd to the druggerman of the Port. He gave it to the Vizir Next him who handed it from one to another to the Grand Vizir who put it in a Scrittoire which Stood near the Grand Signior.

The Druggerman of the Port Translated the Ambassadors Speech into Turkish after which His Excellency retired and having remounted his Horse Stayd in the first Court to See the Janissarys & Ministers of the Port with their Several retinues return in the same order as they came. As they pass'd by, they all bowd to the Ambassador who answerd their salute. The Vizir as he passd threw Shequins to the people.

They then returned to the palace as previously, including the 21-gun salute, to find 'an entertainment prepared for them. The Presents were Sent in the Morning before the Ambassador went and were all ranged in order at the entrance of the Audience Room of the Grand Signior.' In writing to Newcastle about his reception, Kinnoull noted particularly that it was the Grand Vizier who had complimented Kinnoull with a speech that was 'mere form'; the Grand Signior had never answered, leaving that to the Grand Vizier. The whole thing had been simply a formality involving 'presents that are given which put the Grand Signior and the other ministers in humour'. Kinnoull describes the Grand Signior as 'a man about 56, of a black swarthy complexion, middle stature, strong built'.⁹

DIPLOMATIC MATTERS

Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire came to play an increasingly significant role in European affairs during the eighteenth century, particularly with the rise of Peter the Great (who ruled from 1682 to 1725) and Russia's greater involvement in the diplomacy of western Europe, or Christendom as it was then called to distinguish it from the infidel Muslim world. The Ottoman Empire was crucial to Russia's plans for its own expansion, a factor that came to influence the conduct of European diplomatic policy in the eastern Mediterranean.

The extent of the Ottoman Empire at this date was considerable. In Europe it comprised nearly the whole of the Balkan peninsula up to the Danube (with some territories ceded to Austria in 1699 and 1718 but regained in 1739), Bosnia, Moldavia and Wallachia, Bessarabia and the whole north coast of the Black Sea, as well as Cyprus, Crete and the

islands of the Aegean. In Africa it controlled Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis and Algiers, and in Asia Armenia, western Kurdistan, Iraq, Mesopotamia, Syria, the Hijaz, the Yemen and Asia Minor.

It was only as late as 1683 that the Turks had been beaten back from a siege of Vienna. That the infidel had come so near to taking a European capital caused the countries of Christendom considerable alarm. Austria, Russia and Poland were the most closely involved geographically, but other countries were concerned because of their trading interests in the eastern Mediterranean and because of the general desire to maintain 'a just equilibrium of power' between the states of Europe. Given the size of the Ottoman Empire, its potential wealth and military power, it could not be ignored by European governments. Although no western country was prepared to undertake formal treaty obligations with an infidel Muslim state, many were ready to seek Capitulations or trading privileges from Turkey, and to send diplomatic representatives to Constantinople to represent their interests. A group of English merchants, for instance, first obtained a grant of Capitulations from the Sultan, and then a charter from Queen Elizabeth in 1581 giving them exclusive rights to trade in the Ottoman Empire.

The Genoese had been living and trading in the Pera and Galata areas of Constantinople since the thirteenth century, while, since 1265, the Venetian state had been represented by a '*bailo*' (the Italian title given to the Venetian ambassador). The first permanent French ambassador arrived in 1535 and there was an English representative there by 1583. The Austrians were granted Capitulations in 1615. The Russians had no diplomatic mission until 1700, but the Poles had ties from 1533 in a treaty of perpetual friendship and alliance. The Dutch gained the right to Capitulations in 1612, as well as permission to send an ambassador, and the Swedes were allowed a resident minister at the Porte in 1734.¹⁰

All this demonstrates that the states of Christendom wanted a permanent presence in Constantinople to maintain their influence and to have access to the trade of the eastern Mediterranean. The grant of Capitulations was of great significance to the Frankish nations, as they were called, but in theory at least, each grant only lasted as long as the individual sultan survived: on his death each country had to have these concessions reconfirmed, which gave the Turks considerable bargaining power in their negotiations with European powers. The Porte gave up this right of renegotiation in the 1740 grant of Capitulations to the French, when the Sultan formally confirmed the concessions on behalf of

his successors. In fact the Levant Company continued to operate under the 1675 Capitulations until its demise in 1825. It is also true to say that in the long run the growth in the number of people enjoying these special trading privileges, which included the payment of a lower rate of customs duties, would have had a detrimental effect on the Turkish economy.

The expansionist policies that Peter the Great followed in the early years of the eighteenth century concerned both Western Europe and the Ottoman Empire. Russia's borders with Turkey were lengthy, and there were various sources of conflict such as the Tatar tribes, nominally subjects of the Ottoman emperor, who made frequent incursions into Russian territory, and the Cossacks, nominally subjects of the tsar, who often were in conflict with the Turks. In addition, the Russians wanted an outlet to the Black Sea, and took the Turkish port of Azov several times in the early eighteenth century, only to have to restore it later to the sultan. The Russians also had ambitions on the Caspian Sea, and after 1718 took advantage of Turkey's bad relations with Persia to invade Daghestan. The Turks were under no illusions about the threat from Russia; the Grand Vizier told the British ambassador in 1710 that Peter 'promised himself to be one day Master of Constantinople and that he had said he hoped to be buried in the Church of Sancta Sophia'.¹¹

Peter regarded diplomatic initiatives throughout Europe as important. In 1682 when he came to power there had previously been no permanent Russian diplomatic representatives in foreign capitals. By 1721 Russia had 21 permanent diplomatic missions abroad.¹² This worked the other way too; in 1702 there were only four foreign resident diplomats in Russia, but by 1719 there were eleven.¹³ Peter wanted a diplomatic mission in Constantinople to ensure that Russian interests were upheld in this sensitive area, particularly given the number of other embassies from Christendom in the Turkish capital.

Charles VI, Holy Roman emperor and ruler of Austria from 1711 to 1740, also had borders contiguous with the Ottoman Empire. There had been frequent wars between the Austrians and the Turks, notably the one ending with the Treaty of Carlowitz in 1699 when the Turks lost considerable territories to Austria, Poland, Venice and Russia. This major setback for the Turks has been described as 'a watershed in Ottoman history' because it meant closing the Ottoman frontiers in Europe and transforming the state from an expansionist to a defensive empire.¹⁴ Further hostilities resulted in Austria taking more Turkish territory,

including the very important city of Belgrade, by the treaty of Passarowitz in 1718.

However, the Ottoman Empire was still able to retaliate, and by the end of its war against Austria and Russia between 1736 and 1739, the Sublime Porte would reconquer all the territories lost at Carlowitz. Although the Turks had also defeated Russia at the battle of the Pruth in 1711, it still continued to be the most significant long-term European threat to the Sultan's empire. Russian relations with Constantinople remained one of the most delicately-balanced areas of European diplomacy in the first half of the eighteenth century.

When Kinnoull arrived in Constantinople, Russia and the Austrians were allies, having made a treaty, in 1726, of mutual assistance in the event of an attack by an outside power, and this remained the basis of their relationship until the War of Austrian Succession (which occurred after the period with which we are concerned). The Porte regarded both countries with considerable suspicion, an attitude often noted by Lord Kinnoull; in 1733 he observed that 'The great hate that the Turks ... bear to the Muscovites is inconceivable.'¹⁵

France had always regarded itself as having a special relationship with the Sublime Porte, ever since the days of the 1536 Capitulations; indeed the Porte was wont to use the title '*padishah*' to describe the French king, a title normally reserved only for the sultan himself. From 1581 the French ambassador had precedence over all other Western diplomats at the Porte. Turkish trade was very important to French merchants who exported considerable quantities of cloth to the Ottoman Empire, so that Levant Company documents are full of complaints about French predominance in trade in the 1720s and 1730s. Between the 1720s and the 1760s English textile exports direct to the region dropped by half while France's quadrupled.¹⁶ The French also regarded themselves as the guardian of the rights of all Christians within the Empire, particularly of the Catholics, with Jesuits active in Turkish territories. French statesmen wanted to use the Ottoman Empire as a counterweight to the power of the Austrian Hapsburgs; in 1724 the ambassador was told to ensure that 'the power of the Turks always remains an object of fear for the House of Austria'.¹⁷ As we shall see, the French ambassador, the Marquis de Villeneuve, played a significant role during Kinnoull's embassy to the Sublime Porte.

The United Provinces had also been trading within the Ottoman Empire since the sixteenth century, and although the Dutch were not

great players on the European stage at this period, their ambassador Cornelius Calkoen was to be an important figure during Kinnoull's tenure of office. It seems that the Porte placed some reliance on the opinions of the Dutch ambassador, perhaps precisely because his country was less powerful and therefore his views might be more objective.

What was the attitude of the British government to the Ottoman Empire during the first half of the eighteenth century, and how did diplomatic relations within Europe affect British policy? No one in London could by then have said of Constantinople, 'that place is soe remote as any intelligence from hence hither (it is conceaved) can be of little use here', as one of Charles II's secretaries had remarked in 1661.¹⁸ Clearly, the involvement of Austria, Russia and France in the affairs of the Porte meant that Sir Robert Walpole and his Whig administration had to pay close attention to what went on in Constantinople. Interestingly, there were no diplomatic relations between Britain and Russia between 1719 and 1730.¹⁹

During his early years in power in the 1720s, Walpole had been inclined to ally himself with France, despite his memories of the Anglo-French wars under Louis XIV that ended with the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. The French too were ready to compromise, for they feared the power of Austria under Charles VI and were nervous about Louis XV's lack of an heir. Walpole strongly disliked the idea of war because of the cost and the need to raise taxes; he also feared that war could result in an enemy allying with the Jacobites and threatening the Hanoverian succession to the British throne. He therefore made a series of treaties in the 1720s with France, Prussia, the United Provinces and Spain, and with Austria in 1731.

Such a complex political situation clearly required, in an ambassador, experience and diplomatic skills, which Kinnoull did not possess, but, once his feet were on the ground, he naturally began to assess the other ambassadors. It did not take him long to conclude that he would have problems with his task in establishing a good relationship with the Dutch ambassador Calkoen. Writing to Newcastle in code on 10 September 1730,²⁰ he says that Calkoen, who has been in post for three years, is unpopular with all: 'He is a young gentleman, not much above thirty years old' and gets into 'broils with all the ministers here' and hardly speaks to the French ambassador. However, in January 1731 he admits to both the Dutch and the French ambassadors being 'civil' to him.²¹

He assesses Villeneuve, the French ambassador, who has been two years in post, as an 'openhearted worthy good man ... [who has] ... no chicane or trick in his dealings'.²² This was a somewhat naïve assessment of this clever and undoubtedly tricky diplomat who was looking for opportunities to create trouble between the Austrian Empire and the Russians, or between the Turks and both of these.

A few days later he reports on the movements of General Bonneval. This man had had an outstanding French military record but, as a result of a serious misjudgement, had left the army and his country in disgrace. He had then sold his services instead to the Austrians and had served under Prince Eugene who, however, found him to be impulsive and lacking in staying power, so in due course the Emperor sacked him. Villeneuve had no control over him and, indeed, had instructions to have nothing to do with him: a mercenary with his own agenda, but with knowledge of both French and Austrian military organization and tactics, he was a considerable source of worry to Vienna and St Petersburg.²³ Kinnoull hears that Bonneval is apparently in Bosnia looking for employment; he has turned Muslim and changed his name to Achmet Pasha and is expected at court any day.²⁴ By January 1731, Kinnoull says that Bonneval is being held at a village on the way to Smyrna and getting around 25 shillings a day, and that the Turks are likely to use him if there is war against Christians.²⁵

By January 1731, Kinnoull has come to the view that he dislikes the Muscovites and the Germans.²⁶ He hears from Robinson, the English Resident in Vienna, that the Imperial ambassador, Thalmann, is reporting that Kinnoull and Villeneuve are often in conference with the Grand Vizier, as if stirring up the Turks against the Empire, which Robinson describes as 'such a calumny'.²⁷ Kinnoull replies (12 February) thanking Robinson for his letter (which he had in fact received via Thalmann) and says that he has communicated the contents to the French ambassador and they have agreed that 'as the calumny mentioned has ... (no) foundation ... it was best to take no notice of it'.²⁸ However, as we shall see, Thalmann has the last word. Kinnoull covers himself (he hopes) by reporting to Newcastle (5 February) that the Austrians are suspicious that the English and French ambassadors may be trying to move the Porte to war against the Empire. He mentions the Turks' continued unhappiness over losing Belgrade and Temeswar.²⁹ Kinnoull also expresses sympathy for Prince Ragotzki (Rakoczi) who lives, in exile from Austrian-dominated Hungary, outside Constantinople (two days' post) with a

retinue of 60 but a very small allowance from the Porte.³⁰ Turkey had ceded Hungary to Austria in 1698; the Turks were ambitious to use Rakoczi, which they did in 1737–39 when they recovered Hungary.

A year earlier, Stanyan had told Newcastle that Neplyuev, the Russian Resident, had for a long time been asking to leave on health grounds³¹ and his replacement Veshnyakov had just arrived. By April 1731, Kinnoull is reporting that the Tsarina has made Neplyuev an admiral and so he will leave; he says that he has been in Constantinople for ten years and is ‘a very good minister’. Veshnyakov, his colleague but without credentials, will succeed him – he assesses him as a good natured young gentleman but lacking experience.³² By August Neplyuev is still there and has been told to stay. Kinnoull states that ‘No correspondence has passed between the King’s Ambassador and him for many years’ and he asks Newcastle for instructions ‘when the friendship is restored between us and the Muscovites’.³³ By the end of 1732, Kinnoull has come to the conclusion that ‘Nepleof is a cunning old Fox but as he is in a Ticklish Situation at the Porte, because of the suspicion which the Turks have very reasonably of the Muscovites assisting the Persians – under hand in all their affairs, he does not know when he may want friends at the Porte, so that he makes great court to me and we are very well together.’³⁴

At the end of 1731 and the beginning of the next year, Kinnoull has special difficulty demonstrating to Thalmann the friendship he knows is expected of him. This is on account of the particular importance, in diplomatic circles, of matters of precedence. Thalmann has been appointed Internuncio to the Emperor only, but, on this basis, wants to sit on the right hand of the ambassador when visiting; Kinnoull has refused this, as have other ambassadors, since Thalmann is a minister of the second order. All this is spelt out in some detail to Newcastle.³⁵

In January, he addresses a lengthy account to Robinson of Thalmann’s unsuccessful attempts to get the French, English and Venetian ambassadors to send a gentleman of the horse, with led horses, to meet him as recognition of a rank to which, as Internuncio only, he is not entitled. However, Kinnoull has been embarrassed because the Dutch ambassador sent his Gentleman of the Horse plus four led horses in his state livery and caparisons, though Kinnoull had, only the previous day, told the Dutch secretary of his own refusal to do this.³⁶

At last, however, on 15 September 1732, Kinnoull is able to tell Newcastle that Thalmann is now to be recognized as Imperial Resident, as before, and not Internuncio: relations can therefore resume, having

THE NEW AMBASSADOR MAKES A START

been broken for ten months.³⁷ By January 1733 the other ambassadors have also recognized Thalmann's change of status – apart from the French, but Kinnoull tries to persuade Thalmann that this exception is only because no orders have been received from Paris.³⁸

In January 1732, Kinnoull warns Newcastle that Topal Osman, the new Grand Vizier, has brought Bonneval to Constantinople and installed him in a fine palace but with a Thaim or pension only, up from 25/- to 40/- a day.³⁹ By May, Kinnoull says he is finding out details of a plan by the French ambassador to support Topal Osman Pasha in attacking Austria; Bonneval is involved and has promised to train troops in the 'German way'.⁴⁰

Thus, by the end of 1732, Kinnoull appears to have an overall grip of his ambassadorial role and to have some understanding of the political machinations going on around him.

THE PETRIE AFFAIR

There had, however, been one diplomatic incident that could have been very damaging to Kinnoull, but which, fortunately, turned out to his and his mission's considerable advantage.

In February 1732, Captain Petrie of the Levant Company ship *William*, which was in harbour, invited Lord Kinnoull and some of the merchants to dinner on board. In a letter to Newcastle after the affair Kinnoull wrote that the captain:

gave us a very handsome Entertainment, where after Dinner at Drinking His Majesty's and the Royal Family's Healths, Prosperity to the Trade and to the Ship, he fired his Guns, as has been allways practised here. ... He fired some more Guns a little after sun set, and I then told him that that must be the last, because the Grand Signior's Orders were very strict against firing in the Night. I never saw a Dozen of People more happy together nor more pleased than we were all, with the Captain's generous Entertainment, without Drinking, without Noise, without the least Disorder. We sat till 9 o'Clock, passing our time away very agreeably with different Arguments and Discourses which for most part ran upon the Subject of the English Trade in this Countrey. There was an Hungarian Nobleman with me, who said he never saw a Nation so happy together in wishing one another Prosperity so much as appeared to him that night on board the Ship, a great deal of

Friendship and a great deal of Sobriety, which, as matters fell out afterwards, was very lucky, and which is not common in Entertainments on board of English Ships. But it seems that night we were to be more prudent than is ordinary upon such occasions which was very happy.⁴¹

Kinnoull left for shore in the ship's boat at the very respectable hour of 9 p.m., along with some of the merchants and the Hungarian (probably Baron Zy). However, the young merchant John Lisle remained on board. With the boat halfway to Pera, Lisle persuaded the ship's gunner to fire a 15-gun salute. It appeared afterwards that he had known well that this was in breach of the Sultan's regulations and would be likely to have serious consequences for the captain, against whom he apparently had a long-standing grudge.⁴² Hearing the salute, Kinnoull at first assumed that Captain Petrie's enthusiasm had run away with him and that he had ordered the guns to be fired in his honour despite Kinnoull's request to the contrary. Although very worried, initially, about the possibility of the salute causing trouble with the Turkish authorities, he hoped that, since it was early in the evening and also Ramadan, so that the populace were feasting, the matter might be overlooked.

What Kinnoull could not have anticipated, however, was that the Chief Eunuch, who was very close to the Sultan and an expert in intrigue, had been looking for an opportunity to undermine the Grand Vizier, Topal Osman, and saw possibilities in this event. The Chief Eunuch had already helped to engineer the replacement of several grand viziers when it had suited him to do so.

While Topal Osman was normally fairly friendly to the British, he was a man of short temper and was very annoyed by the breach of regulations. It was therefore not difficult for the Chief Eunuch and his supporters to fan the flames and persuade Topal Osman to over-react to the situation grossly.

Early the next morning, two messengers from the Grand Vizier arrived at the embassy and asked Lord Kinnoull to call on Topal Osman in two hours' time. Lord Kinnoull, assuming that the salute was the cause of this request, told his dragoman Pisani to explain the matter fully to the Chief Dragoman of the Porte, in the hope of paving the way to an easier interview with Topal Osman. Kinnoull asked for it to be stressed that he much regretted any offence to the Sultan or his subjects that the firing of the salute might have caused and that he would, himself, deal with the

punishment of whoever was responsible, in line with the provisions of the Capitulations.

When he arrived at the Grand Vizier's palace, Lord Kinnoull was greatly surprised to discover that he was not to be received with the usual ceremony appropriate to the arrival of an ambassador. He was simply shown into an anteroom and asked to wait there. Meanwhile, the French ambassador and various other foreign representatives arrived, were received in the appropriate manner, and were taken into audience with the Grand Vizier.

In due course, Pisani arrived in the anteroom and told Kinnoull, 'with a sorrowfull Countenance', that the Grand Vizier was in a great fury over the matter. Kinnoull later wrote:

I soon perceived that I must not dally in taking a proper resolution becoming the Character of an English Ambassador to prevent this Brute of a Vizir from committing extravagancys that would have been difficult and perhaps impossible to have been excused any manner of way. Therefore I told him that since the Vizir did not know how to treat the King's Ambassador, I had nothing to do there, and that I would immediately return to the Palace where I would be better able to take proper Measures to manage this unruly Monster. Accordingly I retired with all my Court, in great State, Order and Decency, and arrived at the British Palace about 12 o'Clock. ... As I knew the Vizir's Brutal Temper very well I judged that I would have more strength to deal with him than either the Gentlemen of the Nation or the Captain, and that if I could stop his fury against them, he would have some regard for the Character of an Ambassador, if he could by any means be brought to reflect upon what he was doing; and in this I did not judge amiss, for my leaving the Porte in the manner I did, gave the Vizir time to reflect upon the Consequences that might attend a Breach with the English Nation upon such a trifle. When the Vizir saw Me out of his window, on Horseback in the Court, he put himself in a great Passion against the Chehaja (Kahya) or Great Steward and the Reis Effendi or Secretary of State, that they had suffered me to depart; who, however, being very reasonable Persons and my very sound Freinds have told me since, that they were very glad that I had taken that part to go away without seeing the Vizir, because the fear that he was in to lose his Place (His Enemies in the Seraglio

having improved this accident so as to incense the Grand Signior against him) had put him in such a Rage against the English that they would not have been able to have prevented him revenging himself upon me, that he had intirely lost his Temper, and at that time would not have had any regard to the Character I was honoured with, so that they made the best excuses they could for my going away, and he was wisely advised when I was on horseback not to stop me.⁴³

The Grand Vizier then sent for some of the English merchants, and his *kahya* told them, on his behalf, that Lord Kinnoull was to blame for 'this enormous crime', and that, since he would not be acceptable to the Porte as ambassador, they would have to 'chuse the fittest Person amongst themselves to transmit their Business at the Porte till the Arrival of a New Ambassador, and that the Vizir would write to His Majesty to send another Ambassador as soon as possible.' He then arrested the merchants Hanger and Jennings, and let it be known that they would not be released until Captain Petrie was delivered to the authorities. Kinnoull saw that, at least for the moment, Captain Petrie was in serious danger and must be kept out of Turkish hands. He therefore smuggled him into the embassy for safety.

The French, Dutch, and Venetian ambassadors, and in due course the Austrian and Russian representatives also, being by now aware of the situation, offered their help as intermediaries. However, Villeneuve and Calkoen could not agree on the action to be taken, and Kinnoull 'was obliged to manage them with great Care to prevent my being a Sacrifice to the pique those two Ministers have one against another'.

By the next day, Topal Osman had realized that he had over-reacted and indicated that he would appreciate the offer of a mediator: Calkoen indicated his willingness but so also did Villeneuve. Villeneuve's claim that he was best qualified to mediate, since Topal Osman held him (and the French nation in general) in particularly high regard, was probably justified. However, the Chief Eunuch had ensured that the story of Topal Osman's loss of temper was quickly relayed to the Sultan who sacked Topal Osman, appointing the *Daftardar* (finance minister) as deputy until a replacement was found. By good fortune, that suited Kinnoull extraordinarily well because the *Daftardar* was a good friend of his.

The next day Kinnoull received a message from the Sultan:

That the Grand Signior his Majesty being informed that the firing the Guns of the English ship in the night was done by Mistake and out of no bad Design, had forgiven that Offence, upon condition that the British Ambassador would punish the Captain for his imprudent action, and that he had ordered the two English merchants who were confined ... to be delivered to their Ambassador, that there had been a great deal too much Noise made upon account of this Affair, by the bad conduct of his late Vizir whom he had deposed for this and his other evil actions; Therefore he desired that what had passed in this affair might be forgot on both sides.

Hanger and Jennings were released and Captain Petrie was able to return to his ship without any punishment, simply being warned never to allow his guns to be fired at night again. Kinnoull did not discover until some months later that the guns had been fired on Lisle's initiative rather than on Captain Petrie's orders.

The most significant consequence of Topal Osman's dismissal was that French influence at the Porte was much reduced. Many years before, a Spanish privateer had captured Topal Osman while he had been travelling at sea. Badly injured and held to ransom, a Frenchman rescued him and trustingly advanced the ransom money. As a consequence Topal Osman had a particularly soft spot for the French nation.

In being hand in glove with France, Topal Osman regarded the Austrians and Russians with strong suspicion and hence shared France's desire that the Porte should try to be at peace with Persia so as to be free to take action, as might be necessary or desirable, against Austria or Russia. It was the policy of Great Britain to prevent war between the Porte and Austria or Russia and the replacement of Topal Osman ensured a change of Ottoman policy in that direction. In the words of Kinnoull:

Our good Ally the Emperor should give Captain Petre a Flag for his good Service upon this occasion, for if Osman Pasha had continued Grand Vizir the Turkish Army would certainly have been assembled this Summer, in order to have marched next Spring to the German [that is, the Austrian] Frontier.'

Topal Osman was not disgraced, however: he became governor of

Trebizond and when war with Persia broke out in 1733 he was put in charge of the Ottoman forces. He was killed in a major battle a few months later.

So Kinnoull came out of the affair with flying colours, but one is left wondering about the motives of Lisle and indeed other merchants who may have been involved; whether there was not only some malicious intent towards Captain Petrie, but also perhaps some political intent to embarrass the ambassador – by a member of the Levant Company whose brother was MP for Southampton. The affair throws much light on the relationships between the ‘Frank’ ambassadors and reveals something of the uncertainty involved in dealing with the Porte.

TURKISH AFFAIRS

The considerable geographical extent of the Ottoman Empire during the early eighteenth century has already been noted. We should now consider the central organization of this empire, based as it was in Constantinople, so as to understand what sorts of problems the foreign ambassadors to the Sublime Porte had in trying to cope with the day-to-day workings of the Ottoman state.

The sultan was the supreme ruler or *padishah* of the Ottoman Empire, both in secular and religious matters. All law emanated from him, and he was commander in chief of the army. However, various factors limited his powers. The size of the Empire made it necessary to devolve power to regional governors and to rely heavily on the substantial bureaucracy that ran the departments of central government. During the early eighteenth century the role of the grand vizier and his effendis or ‘men of the pen’ became increasingly important. They worked from a set of offices outside the Seraglio that came to be known as the Sublime Porte. An Irish visitor in 1749 described the workings of this bureaucracy thus:

All the Ministers who hold their offices at the Porte have, besides their apartments, chambers adjoining, which serve as secretary’s offices in which their clerks write. I went into five or six of them and was astonished at the multitude of the clerks, the singular attitude in which they write, and the great expedition and regularity with which business is carried on.⁴⁴

As holder of the royal seal, the grand vizier was the most powerful man in the Empire after the sultan. He was the principal channel of communi-

cation between the closed world of the Seraglio and the outside world. There were many other important officials: the *reis effendi* who had particular responsibility for foreign affairs, the influential *kisla aga* who was the chief black eunuch with the task of running the Imperial harem or House of Felicity, the chief *defterdar* or treasurer, and the *Kaptan Pasha*, the admiral of the fleet. The most important officials and Muslim clerics formed the *divan* or ruling council, which was directly responsible for carrying out the sultan's orders. It also had the vital function of administering justice.

In addition, the ulema (scholars) had considerable power and influence. These were graduates from the *medrese* or colleges for the study of the Koran and Islamic law. The mufti of Constantinople, or Sheikh ul Islam, was their leader, and it was his task to issue fatwas confirming that the laws the sultan made or any actions he took were in accordance with sharia law. The ulema were traditional in outlook and resisted any attempts to introduce change or to import ideas from western Europe. In a dispatch to Newcastle, Sir Everard Fawkenor (Kinnoull's successor) made clear this dislike of change: 'Other nations may suit and adapt their maxims to their circumstances, but the Turkish Policy and Government is so interwoven with their religion that they cannot make any alterations, and without them they can neither annoy their neighbours nor defend themselves.'⁴⁵

The janissaries, or foot soldiers, and the *sipahis*, or cavalry, were an ever-present force in Turkish affairs. Originally, many of the janissaries had been drawn from the *devshirme*, or forced levy of children from the Christian populations of the Ottoman Empire, a necessary policy because the Koran did not permit the enslavement of Muslims. These children became slaves who would be trained as soldiers, bureaucrats or palace servants. Because they owed their whole livelihood to the sultan, they were believed to be more loyal than freeborn Muslims. However, by the seventeenth century more and more janissaries were recruited from Muslim freemen and their loyalty became less certain. They became well-known for voicing their complaints and even for leading rebellions. On payday, when they were fed pilau from special cauldrons in the second court of the Seraglio, they were wont to turn the cauldrons over and beat them with their spoons as an expression of dissatisfaction. Any grand vizier or sultan was wise to take heed of such displays.

Despite his overarching powers, the sultan could be overthrown if he displeased his subjects. In 1703 Mustafa II was deposed by a janissary

rebellion caused at least in part by his preference for living at Edirne (the present-day Adrianople) rather than in the capital. His successor Ahmed III was also forced to resign after a revolt led by Patrona Halil, a street-seller of clothes, following widespread disillusion with increasing taxes, the wars with Persia and the extravagant lifestyle of the Sultan. Ahmed was succeeded by Mahmud I in 1730, but it was some time before peace could be restored to Constantinople and many thousands of rebels died. Kinnoull, who arrived in the city in 1729 and therefore saw these events unfold, wrote that ‘the diabolical spirit of the people ... is so very great that they are continually throwing papers about the streets threatening never to desist doing mischief till they have burnt all Constantinople.’⁴⁶ Another smaller revolt in 1731 claimed many more lives before Mahmud and his officials finally managed to regain control of the city.

It was not only the sultan who might be overthrown by popular demand. The job of grand vizier was by no means an enviable one because he had to maintain the favour of the sultan, avoid being ousted by jealous rivals and risk the wrath of the public. Between 1703 and 1718 there were no fewer than 13 grand viziers.⁴⁷ In the 1730 revolt the leader Patrona Halil demanded the head of the Grand Vizier whose body was later thrown out of the Sultan’s palace into the street, along with those of other senior officials who had displeased the rebels.

From the point of view of the Turks, all foreigners were viewed with disdain and some suspicion. For them, Constantinople was the unrivalled centre of the universe with the sultan or *padishah* as ruler of the vast Ottoman Empire. In the sixteenth century Suleyman the Magnificent would begin his letters thus: ‘I who am the Sultan of Sultans, the Sovereign of Sovereigns, the distributor of crowns to the Monarchs of the globe, the Shadow of God upon Earth.’⁴⁸ It is therefore not surprising that the Ottomans were little impressed with infidel ambassadors sent by rulers from unknown countries across the sea who, despite their best efforts, could not rival the splendours of the Ottoman court, and whose powers were so limited. The Ottoman and Frankish religious and political frames of reference were poles apart, making it hard for each to understand the viewpoint of the other even without the problems of linguistic communication.

Paul Rycaut, who was secretary to the Earl of Winchelsea, British ambassador in Constantinople in the 1660s, believed that ‘the Turks do confess themselves obliged by their own law to rules of civilities,

courteous treatment, and protection of Embassadors.⁴⁹ However, he also summed up their attitude to other countries thus:

The Turks ... are naturally a proud and insolent people, confident, and conceited of their own virtue, valour and forces, which proceeds from their ignorance of the strength and constitution of other Countries; so that when the danger which may arise from the Conjunction and Union of Christian Princes to the Mahometan Interest, is discoursed of, they compare the Grand Signior to the Lyon, and other Kings to little Dogs, which may serve ... to rouse and discompose the quiet and Majesty of the Lyon, but can never bite him, but with their utmost peril.⁵⁰

The Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa had made the position abundantly clear to Sir John Finch, English ambassador in the late seventeenth century:

You and all other ambassadors are sent hither by your respective princes to answer for the lives and estates of all Mussulmans all over the world that are endangered or suffer by your respective subjects, and you are here a hostage to answer for all damage done by all Englishmen all over the world.⁵¹

The sultan did not hesitate, therefore, to use his powers to imprison foreign envoys in Constantinople with whom he was displeased. In 1710 the Muscovite ambassador was seized and imprisoned in the dreaded Seven Towers, as was the Venetian *bailo* in 1714. The Seven Towers was a castle on the shores of the Sea of Marmara, just within the city walls. It had a fearsome reputation for the treatment meted out to prisoners, many of whose bodies disappeared into the sea. In 1736 when the Russians advanced into the Crimea and the Turks declared war, the Russian Resident Veshnyakov was fearful of being imprisoned there too; in the event he was merely escorted to the frontier and allowed home.

It is probably fair to say that from the seventeenth century the Ottoman Empire began a long, slow decline. There were various reasons for this. One was the absence of any long-term stability at the head of government. Sultans could be overthrown and grand viziers only lasted so long as they maintained the sultan's trust. Other factors meant that it was difficult to ensure stable government. For instance, the wars with Persia

dragged on intermittently from 1722 to 1736, and peace was only made because it was clear that war with Russia was imminent. Wars were expensive and the population often resented them for the tax increases they frequently brought. On the other hand, defeats of the Ottoman armies could also cause unrest among the people, and Kinnoull noted that the results of battles were often misreported at first, with the truth only emerging later. He reports, for instance, that the Grand Vizier Osman Pasha has won a remarkable victory over the Persians in August 1733, but on 23 November he had news that in fact the Ottoman army had been routed and Osman Pasha killed.⁵²

Although the sultan could call on large numbers of soldiers and ships, his forces were ill-equipped and badly trained, especially when compared with the armies of Christendom. This weakness was recognized in 1732 when the Grand Vizier employed General Bonneval to introduce some restructuring to the Ottoman army, but he found it very difficult to overcome tradition and the conservative elements among the janissaries. Traditionally, if there was to be war, the sultan and the grand vizier would cross the Bosphorus to the Asian side where the main military and naval forces would assemble. The army would then march off under the command of the grand vizier. However, supplying the troops was very difficult over the long distances involved in the Persian and Russian wars, difficulties that also applied to the Ottoman forces stationed permanently in the outlying provinces. The navy too could not compete with the Frankish powers; in fact, not until after the Treaty of Carlowitz in 1699 did the Turks begin a slow change from the use of oar-power for their naval vessels to the use of sail-power.

Among the most important reasons for the Ottoman Empire's decline were the forces of conservatism. The religious leaders in particular resisted any change; for them, any necessary reform would be achieved by implementing existing religious law better, not by any structural changes to the government. Scribes fearing the loss of their jobs opposed innovations such as the first printing press able to produce books in Ottoman Turkish in Constantinople in 1729, although Ibrahim Muteferrika in fact published a number of non-religious books before the printing press was forcibly closed down in 1742. This was probably the most enduring example of Western technology influencing Ottoman society in the early eighteenth century.

There were economic difficulties too. The opening up of sea trade routes to the east was a long-term threat to the Ottoman Empire's

control of the land routes. In addition, the influx of gold and silver from the Americas caused high inflation in western Europe. This inflation later fed through to the Turkish economy, and there are many examples of Kinnoull and Fawkener complaining of the increased cost of living in Constantinople.

Some sultans and grand viziers did realize the importance of finding out how things were done in Europe. Damad Ibrahim, one of Ahmed III's grand viziers, sent Turkish envoys to Paris, Vienna, Moscow and Poland. The visit of Mehmed Effendi to Louis XV in Paris between 1720 and 1721 was undertaken 'to visit fortresses and factories, and to make a thorough study of the means of civilization and education, and to report on those suitable for application to the Ottoman Empire',⁵³ although ostensibly this visit was to give the French permission to repair the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.

Kinnoull noted that there was a Resident sent from the Porte to Vienna, which was 'so great a convenience' to the Turks because of the information he supplied.⁵⁴ However, these missions were not usually permanent, and the Porte tended to rely on reports from its merchants, spies and other contacts. On occasion, the grand vizier would summon a Frankish envoy to ask for news; for instance, after Stanislaus's defeat by the Russians at Danzig during the War of the Polish Succession, the Grand Vizier Ali Pasha summoned the Dutch ambassador Calkoen to give his views on recent events.⁵⁵

The place where western European influences were most pronounced was within the grand signor's immediate circle. During the reigns of Mustafa II (1695–1703) and Ahmed III (1703–30) it became fashionable to emulate European furniture, palaces and garden design, with French influence particularly strong. When Mehmed Effendi was sent abroad to Paris it is likely that he brought back prints of Versailles that were used to design the Imperial gardens within the Seraglio.⁵⁶ This was known as the 'Tulip period' or *Lale Devri*, because there was a craze for growing as many as 12000 varieties of tulip, many imported from Holland and Persia. Some varieties were so rare that their sale outside the capital was punishable by exile.⁵⁷ In April each year a tulip festival was held, with the fourth court of the Seraglio decorated with tulips in vases, singing birds and lamps of coloured glass.⁵⁸ While Kinnoull was in post the Levant Company included hundreds of jonquil and hyacinth bulbs among the presents given to important Turkish officials who vied with one another to produce new varieties.⁵⁹

During the Tulip period pleasure became the sultan's guiding principle. The sultan's court seemed 'perpetually bent upon some new excursion, continually filing by in gorgeous cavalcade or floating upon the waves of the Bosphorous or the Golden Horn'.⁶⁰ In Ahmed's reign the Grand Vizier Damad Ibrahim did his utmost to provide an endless round of entertainment for the court. It was he who initiated the building of Sa'adabat, the Sultan's pleasure palace on the Sweet Waters of Asia, on the upper reaches of the Golden Horn. Other members of the Turkish ruling class soon followed suit and as many as 300 wooden palaces were built, many to be destroyed during the 1730 rebellion. A French visitor in the retinue of the French ambassador went 'to stroll in Sa'adabad accompanied by most of the French residents of Constantinople.' He noted that the Turks had also taken to walking there: 'People of the country and foreigners of all ages and sexes go there alone.'⁶¹

The extravagance and decadence of the Tulip period aroused the opposition of the people, contributing to the 1730 rebellion and overthrow of Ahmed III. Under his successor Mahmud I (1730–54), a number of the measures to open Turkey to Western influences continued. It was during his reign that Bonneval worked to modernize the bombardier corps and to introduce more up-to-date weaponry to the army. The Sultan saw to the building of a new aqueduct to supply Constantinople, and built a number of public libraries.⁶² The printing press was allowed to continue producing non-religious books and a paper mill was established.

From the Turkish point of view, relations with Persia were at least as important as those with Christendom. There was a long history of wars with the Persians and when, in the early eighteenth century, the weakness of Persia became obvious, the Ottomans intervened to secure their own position and to prevent extensive Russian gains. A compromise was reached in a treaty between Constantinople and St Petersburg in 1724, but the rise to power in Persia of Nadir Shah, also known as Tamas Kuli Khan, meant that the Persian armies set about reconquering territory that the Turks had taken from them. The Ottoman Turks expended a great deal of time and money in these wars, which distracted them from taking a more active part in European affairs, much to the relief of British ministers. Kinnoull received frequent instructions from Newcastle that he must prevent any rift between the Porte and Austria or Russia that could result in war. We have noted the anxiety of other European countries that the French were putting pressure on the Ottoman Empire to attack

the Austrians or the Russians; Kinnoull always believed that this would not happen so long as the Turkish/Persian wars continued, and in this he was right. In fact the Turks finally made a disadvantageous peace with Nadir Shah in 1735 as a conflict with Russia seemed inevitable, and war did finally break out between the two powers in May 1736.

Outbreak of war against Persia was imminent in July 1730 and Kinnoull wrote that the Grand Vizier had been sent to the frontier with troops. He gave a long description of the troops setting out from Scutari – he had hired a house to watch.⁶³

Then, at the end of September, rebels took advantage of the absence of the Grand Signor and the Grand Vizier, at Scutari with the army: they made a hasty return, but too late. Kinnoull was able to observe the 1730 rebellion at close quarters. So, doubtless, was Samuel Medley, but unfortunately for us, he had not started his diary by then. Kinnoull wrote⁶⁴ that the Grand Vizier, *Chehaia* and Captain Pasha were killed and Sultan Ahmed deposed in favour of his nephew Mahmud, who was taken to Eiup where the rebels ‘put the Imperial sword upon him which is their ceremony in place of a Coronation’. Kinnoull had returned from Belgrade village with ‘all our merchants who retire there in the time of the Plague ... [and] found our part of the town as quiet as if nothing had happened’. The aga of janissaries had ordered no plundering. Kinnoull was very surprised at the speed with which the rebellion was over. He was convinced that a stand by the Grand Vizier and Aga could have crushed the rebels, but the Grand Signor had insisted on shutting himself up in the Seraglio and waiting; the Aga had defected to the rebels. There had been a smooth change of nearly all chief officers and the duties imposed by the late Grand Vizier had been taken off.⁶⁵

An express from Constantinople on 28 December tells us of retribution: the Grand Signor enticed rebel leaders into the Seraglio ‘under pretence of a Conference ... [and] ordered the Heads of 28 of the most considerable to be cut off’.⁶⁶

Following the rebellion, Kinnoull wonders if there will be a good opportunity to get the Capitulations renewed. He also wonders whether it may provide an opportunity to readjust precedences at the Porte; whether he should be regarded as an ambassador extraordinary. The French ambassador says he has double credentials and Kinnoull is concerned to prevent him from taking advantage of the situation to score points. He considers the diplomatic niceties of letters of congratulation from HM government.

Kinnoull then does his best to dissuade the Grand Vizier from sending Turkish ambassadors to England, France and Holland notifying the change of grand signor – he has various reasons to take this line, not least the thorny problems of finding appropriate ceremonial procedures for ambassadors, the cost to His Majesty’s Government and the Levant Company of the ambassador, plus a retinue for seven or eight months plus presents on departure.⁶⁷ He says the new Grand Vizier is Ibrahim Pasha, an ‘old man about 70 but healthy [and] ... very kind to the Christians.’⁶⁸ There was then a failed rebellion in April⁶⁹ followed by more government changes in June.⁷⁰ Kinnoull bewails the deposition of Capitan Pasha Gianin Khogia – ‘a great loss ... a great friend to the English’; he also notes a victory over the Persians at Erwan, with many executions of vanquished Khans.⁷¹

Via the Russian ambassador, the St Petersburg court ‘received an Express from Constantinople (in June) by which they are informed that the troubles in that country are not yet appeas’d tho’ the Grand Signor has put to death above 16000 rebels since he ascended the throne.’⁷² By August 1731 Kinnoull is telling Newcastle that he reckons that, in the Grand Vizier’s continued campaign against any rebels, 100,000 have been put to death since the previous September. There are shortages and high prices and incendiary devices are planted all over the city, which presents a great danger to the wooden houses.⁷³

There is a more optimistic note in November after Kinnoull has had an audience with the new Grand Vizier Topal Osman Pasha who is ‘an extraordinary good man’ and favours the Franks. He is also popular for reducing food prices.⁷⁴ But this is the man who, three months later, lost his job over the Petrie affair, at which time Kinnoull was rationalizing that his removal was to his and England’s advantage.

COMMUNICATIONS

The personalities involved in the diplomatic round in Constantinople in the years 1729 to 1735 were of considerable significance. The whole saga of Kinnoull’s embassy illustrates how the actions of one ambassador could be construed by those around him to his disadvantage.⁷⁵ This was a closed world, where everyone tried hard to find out what other diplomats were doing and what news had come from Christendom or from the outlying parts of the Ottoman Empire. The difficulties were obvious. First, there was the language problem. The diplomats did not speak Turkish and therefore relied entirely on their dragomans to

undertake dealings with the Turks (although Jacob Colyer, the Dutch representative at the Porte until 1725, was an exception, speaking Ottoman and Greek fluently).⁷⁶ Second, there was the delay in getting information to Europe and in receiving instructions. A letter to London could easily take six weeks to arrive there, and any reply could take even longer. The two principal routes for mail were via Vienna, where it was known that Imperial officials opened and read diplomatic dispatches, and by sea via Marseilles. This second route was more dangerous in that ships were often captured by pirates and were exposed to bad weather. Another complication of diplomatic life was the extreme difficulty of keeping anything secret in Constantinople. In a revealing dispatch to Newcastle, Kinnoull states that Neplyuev, the Russian ambassador, has given him an account of a recent conference with the Grand Vizier: 'I have not as yet been able to find out if he [Neplyuev] has hid any part of his conference from me. But if there was any secret in his audience, I shall know it in a few days.'⁷⁷

Although French was generally considered to be the language of diplomacy in eighteenth-century Europe, in Constantinople Italian was widely used. This was principally because many of the dragomans, although Turkish subjects, were Genoese and so native Italian speakers, and found it easier to provide written translations of documents from Turkish into Italian than, say, into English or French. Fawkenor, Kinnoull's successor, reported to Newcastle that a letter for the Grand Vizier had been submitted in English and Italian to the Dragoman of the Porte who had then translated it into Turkish for the vizier's attention.⁷⁸ Sir James Porter, ambassador from 1746 to 1762, remarked that it was always necessary 'to have the original Turkish paper accompanied by an Italian translation'.⁷⁹ Some of the Turks spoke Italian; Villeneuve records a conversation in an '*italien corrompu*' with an important Turkish official.⁸⁰

Kinnoull makes the occasional remark about conversations in other languages; for example, he says that Count Sierakowski, the Polish envoy, addressed him in 'very bad Latin' to which Kinnoull replied in French.⁸¹ De Saussure acknowledged that the ambassador's spoken French was quite fluent, but that when Kinnoull needed letters written in French, de Saussure did this for him.⁸² We can perhaps assume that for day-to-day exchanges between ambassadors from Britain, Russia, Austria, France, Poland, Venice and Sweden, French would have been the most widely used medium of conversation. For their dealings with the Turks, they were all dependent on their dragomans.

In circumstances of government like these, there were clearly difficulties for all foreigners. Ambassadors found it hard to discover what was going on within the Ottoman court because they did not speak the language and in any case it was not easy to gain access to the sources of power. If they wished to communicate with the grand vizier or the *reis effendi*, they relied for translation either on their own dragomans or on the Chief Dragoman to the Porte, who at this period was traditionally a Phanariot Greek⁸³ and a Christian. This ranked as an extremely important post. Chief Dragoman Ghika who held this job in the 1730s expected and received many splendid gifts from ambassadors. The ambassadors' personal dragomans were Turkish subjects even though they were attached to individual Western embassies, and they were loath to be the bearers of bad news to important Turkish officials. It was therefore by no means unusual for the contents of an ambassadorial message to be changed. As we shall see, Kinnoull experienced many problems with his interpreters, but this was fairly normal among the Frankish ambassadors. Calkoen wrote to The Hague in 1727 that he found it very difficult to be 'daily exposed to people to whom one is supposed to entrust one's secrets, though knowing that they will only be moved by nature and by their own interests to deceive and cheat'.⁸⁴

It has to be said that the dragomans were right in believing their position to be precarious. For instance, in 1731 Angelo Emo, the Venetian *bailo*, reported that a Turkish dragoman had become too friendly with Neplyuev, the Russian Resident, and the Grand Vizier had therefore ordered his execution. The Grand Vizier directed that in future all dragomans should attend only their designated embassy and the sultan's palace.⁸⁵

The French made considerable efforts to overcome the problem of finding efficient and trustworthy dragomans. The Capuchin college in Pera undertook to train youths from local Frankish families as '*jeunes de langues*' (*giovani di lingua*) and to teach them Arabic and French. This was later extended with Christian youths from the Ottoman Empire being sent to Paris for their education. The Levant Company tried bringing some Greeks to England and sending them to Oxford to learn English, with a view to their becoming dragomans, but the scheme was a failure and lapsed.⁸⁶

In the closed world of Europeans in Constantinople rumour and gossip were rife and secrets hard to keep. There was little mixing with Turks, although it was common to meet up with Albanians, Greeks,

Jews and Italians in Pera where most foreigners lived. All the embassies or ‘palaces’ were situated here, which meant that everyone knew (or tried to find out) what went on in other compounds.

Everybody acknowledged that bribery and presenting gifts were an essential part of the functioning of the Ottoman administration. The difficulties of obtaining information could be partially overcome by these means, a fact the Venetians and French understood well. Thus, we find Kinnoull writing that the Dragoman of the Porte who, among other things, controls access to the *reis effendi*, favours the French, who pay him an annual pension of £150 plus presents. He receives nothing from England and the Levant Company will not pay out. Kinnoull wants the King to do so. The French are in fact currently out of favour and Kinnoull would like money to exploit this.⁸⁷

This need for bribery continued throughout the eighteenth century; in 1763 Henry Grenville, the British ambassador wrote to London: ‘The Measures of the Ottoman Porte Are Generally very secret, always very sudden: In order to be well and early informed, Money must be liberally and Artfully applied; This is the Channel of Information in this corrupt, irregular Govt.’⁸⁸

The other major communications problem for Kinnoull and indeed for the other ambassadors was that of speed and reliability in sending news home and receiving orders and notice of policy changes.

By the end of July 1730, the only letter to have been delivered from London since his arrival on 14 April, was dated 2 April; he writes that he fears that the Austrians are deliberately holding up letters in Vienna.⁸⁹ He hoped for some letters via France but none had come by 19 August.⁹⁰

In the absence of letters, he lacks not only vital instructions but also news, although the French ambassador sends him all his newspapers.⁹¹ Early in 1731, he writes to Robinson, in Vienna: ‘If you would be so good as to send me any Dutch or other newspapers you have ... I should be glad. ... For in this out of the way Corner of the world, the common news from Christendom is a great amusement’⁹² – something of an understatement! He also, then and on other occasions, asks Robinson to forward an enclosure to Newcastle, presumably because he hopes that this may be a safe way of ensuring that his letter reaches England.⁹³ Delafaye also sends various items to Kinnoull via Robinson.⁹⁴ Robinson obliged with a supply of newspapers but it would seem that they did not arrive until November, when Kinnoull writes: ‘PS I thank you for the

newspapers you was so kind to send me by Sig. Luca.⁹⁵ In May 1731 he thanks Robinson for a letter dated 21 March, 'which had been 37 days on the Road yet it brought the first Account of the Treaty [of Vienna] to this Place'. Thalmann's letters did not arrive until three days later, which must, at least, have been some compensation for Kinnoull.⁹⁶

The Levant Company tended to prefer to use its own ships for communications, such as a letter in November that was 'put into the Williams's bag at the Sword Blade coffee house',⁹⁷ rather than using the land route, but this method was also subject to long delays. In December, worried by requests from the British factory in London that he should write to it, Kinnoull asks Robinson if he can investigate and resolve the problem that has resulted in letters being held up in Vienna before being forwarded for '3 weeks or a month sometimes longer after they arrive' there.⁹⁸

The scale of these delays was such that if Kinnoull wrote a letter to Newcastle asking for instructions on some point, it was likely to take a minimum of five weeks to arrive (but it could be several months, or it might never get there); even if Newcastle did not have to refer the matter to the King and had the time to deal with it immediately, the reply was likely to take another five weeks to get back to Constantinople. By then, the whole scenario could well have changed beyond recognition.

A further occasional complication that might occur is illustrated by a postscript to a letter to Robinson in June 1732, in which Kinnoull says he is not sure if the King is in Hanover; he hears Harrington (rather than Newcastle) is to go there with him; if so, can Robinson send Harrington a copy of the letter that he (Kinnoull) has already sent to Newcastle?⁹⁹

There was then, of course, potential for delay at Kinnoull's end, with respect to taking action on any instructions received, because of possible delays in gaining access to whoever needed to be approached. In writing to Newcastle on 13 December 1732, Kinnoull mentions that illness has prevented him from delivering His Majesty's letters to the Grand Vizier and the Grand Signor.¹⁰⁰ These are the replies to the letters from the new, post-rebellion Grand Signor and Grand Vizier in January 1731! In fact, they had still not been delivered by the end of January 1733 because Kinnoull, who was still unwell, was out at Belgrade village and the Grand Vizier did not want him back in the Porte until he had properly recovered, given that the plague was raging everywhere.¹⁰¹

Quite apart from the frustration of these bad communications,

THE NEW AMBASSADOR MAKES A START

Kinnoull was also somewhat homesick, as he reveals in letters to Delafaye and Robinson in January 1733, saying that he enjoys great comfort in hearing from friends at home¹⁰² and ‘You can’t imagine what a Comfort a short letter from a Countryman is to one that is in a manner banished in such a barbarous Country as I am, from all Sorts of reasonable conversation.’¹⁰³

THE LEVANT COMPANY AND THE EMBASSY

The principal reason for English interest in the Ottoman Empire was trade, at least in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. French merchants had been granted trading rights at Constantinople as early as 1535,¹⁰⁴ while Italian city states such as Venice and Genoa had been involved in commerce with the Turks for many centuries.

In 1578 two English merchants sent their agent William Harborne to Constantinople to gain trading rights, or Capitulations, from the Sultan, which Harborne achieved in June 1580. In the following year Queen Elizabeth I granted a charter to a group of merchants, giving them the sole right to trade with Turkey for seven years, with all other English subjects excluded. This royal backing was important because it enhanced the status of the Company (and its representative) in the eyes of the Turkish government. However, the Queen did not wish to pay for sending or maintaining Harborne as ambassador, and the Company therefore found itself footing the bill. This put the English ambassador in an anomalous position since he was ‘at once a royal representative, commissioned by the sovereign and employed in diplomatic duties, and a commercial agent paid for by a company of merchants, and pledged to safeguard and promote their business interests’.¹⁰⁵ This was in contrast to the position of other ambassadors to the Ottoman Empire, nearly all of whom were paid directly by their governments, even though they might have some responsibility for their own merchants. (Calkoen, the Dutch ambassador, was in fact paid partly by his government and partly by the directorate of Levantine Trade, a group of merchants based in Amsterdam.)¹⁰⁶ The British ambassador’s anomalous situation continued until 1763 when £3 a day became payable to him from the civil list, and in 1804 the British government finally took over full responsibility for payment of its ambassador to the Porte.¹⁰⁷

A further charter was granted to the Company in 1605, as ‘The Governor and Company of Merchants of England trading into the Levant Seas’, remaining in force until 1825. The Sultan granted the

Capitulations, or terms under which the English were allowed to trade, in 1580, and renewed them in 1601. These included the right to trade freely, to appoint consuls and to have the ambassador place English subjects on trial for crimes under English law. Favourable levels of customs duties were also granted. The principal articles of export from England were broad cloth, lead and tin, while imports included currants, spices and silk. Consulates were established in Aleppo and Smyrna to facilitate trade. There was opposition to the English newcomers from the French and the Venetians, and the Company's fortunes waxed and waned as struggles took place in the wider European context with the Dutch, French and Spaniards.

The appointment of each new ambassador had initially been made by the Levant Company putting forward its own candidate for royal approval, but from the 1690s it became the custom for the Crown to nominate its own candidate and for the Company to agree. In fact, as we have already seen, the role of ambassador had become increasingly important by the beginning of the eighteenth century as Constantinople began to assume greater significance in the politics of Europe.

George Hay, eighth earl of Kinnoull, was appointed British ambassador to the Porte on 16 May 1729. There seems no obvious positive reason why he was chosen; he had no diplomatic experience and no known interest in trade in the Levant (in fact he was hastily admitted as a freeman of the Company in June 1729). Other members of the nobility had been appointed ambassador to the Porte, and in general being a peer could help with securing a diplomatic post: 'the candidate [could] bring pressure upon the government to give him a chance in diplomacy.'¹⁰⁸ However Kinnoull was suspected of Jacobite tendencies and his appointment by what was a Whig administration might seem a curious choice.¹⁰⁹ His predecessor, Abraham Stanyan, had been in the post since 1718 and he seems to have performed his job satisfactorily because the Grand Vizier praised him for having 'discharged the duty of his embassy in a commendable manner'.¹¹⁰ A study of Stanyan's dispatches to the Secretary of State and to the Levant Company in London shows some of the financial difficulties with which he lived; Kinnoull would inherit these, as would all British ambassadors to the Porte until late in the eighteenth century.

Money, or the lack of it, was a perennial problem. The allowance the Levant Company paid was inadequate and there was very little forthcoming from the Crown. Giving bribes and presents to Turkish officials was crucial for the successful conduct of business in

Constantinople, and it was expensive. The ambassador's household had to put on a proper show because appearances were of great importance in maintaining prestige in Turkey. In addition, extra expenses inevitably arose and were the subject of endless correspondence.

One good example of these problems occurred shortly before Kinnoull's arrival when the British embassy burnt down in 1725 with an estimated loss to Ambassador Stanyan of 5214 dollars' (£760) worth¹¹¹ of personal goods.¹¹² Fires often broke out in the wooden buildings of Constantinople. The Company felt that the expense either of rebuilding on the same site or purchasing the Dutch embassy, which was about to be sold, should fall on the Crown and not on the merchants. A petition was duly sent to the King to this effect and correspondence between Stanyan and Newcastle, the Secretary of State, continued for some time. Stanyan eventually paid out money both to rent part of the Dutch embassy and for work to be done on building a new British embassy on the old site. Unfortunately, we do not know the full outcome of this matter, except that Stanyan moved out when the new Dutch ambassador Cornelius Calkoen arrived in May 1727. He also reported that the Levant Company had given him 600 dollars (£90) towards the rebuilding, but he had personally already spent 900 dollars (£140).¹¹³

Kinnoull never made ends meet and although he was doubtless not good at managing his money, a fact that is clearly demonstrated in his correspondence almost from the start of his embassy, the funds were in fact inadequate. When he was still trying to pay off debts in 1742, he and his son, writing jointly, summarized their version of the causes of his problems to his Trustees as follows:

When Lord Kinnoull went to Constantinople in the year 1730, he found himself engaged in an Embassy with a very small salary of £1250 (per annum) paid by the Turkey Company, to the expence of which the King did not contribute one farthing, not so much as the necessary plate, which all his other Ambassadors receive. – He found himself under a necessity to furnish a great House built there by the company for the reception of the Ambassador (at least in a decent manner) from the Cellar to the Garret. – The Company's trade was declining, so that he could expect no relief from them, on the contrary, they were every year necessitated to lessen the Expence of the Embassy in many articles, which had been profitable to his predecessors. – L^d Kinnoull finding himself in this

situation, represented his case to his Majesty; But as the King was unwilling to draw upon himself any part of the Expence of that Embassy or to give the colour of a pretence to the Company, to petition His Majesty to deliver them from the Burthen of the whole, this application proved fruitless; tho' his Demand of an additional allowance from the King was judged very reasonable by the Ministers. – So that he was obliged to struggle six years in that country, with a heavy expence, much above the Companys allowance and being willing at any rate, to keep up the credit of the King his Master & of the nation, at that Court, he spent in that time above £4000 st. more than the salary he received.¹¹⁴

It appears that, in the period of Kinnoull's embassy, the Company paid the ambassador a salary of £1400¹¹⁵ in quarterly instalments, and an annual gratuity of 2000 dollars (nearly £300).¹¹⁶ The lack of agreement with the figure of £1250, which he quoted to his trustees, could have been caused by some confusion over what was 'salary', what was 'gratuity' and what were 'expenses', but one suspects simply by over-enthusiasm in trying to present a strong case for relief of his debts!

There were allowances for travel expenses to and from Constantinople, but the initial equipage allowance had apparently been withdrawn.¹¹⁷ The Turkish government, at least in theory, paid each envoy or ambassador a daily allowance while he was in the country, but this was difficult to obtain. A further source of income came from the sale of wine, since diplomats were allowed to import large quantities duty-free and could sell on the surplus.¹¹⁸

The sale of *barats* could also be lucrative. These were documents that the Porte issued to foreign diplomats and that gave them, their servants and interpreters certain protections and exempted them from having to pay local taxes. However, a trade developed in which ambassadors sold *barats* to Jews, Armenians, Greeks and others who could afford to purchase them and thus enjoy the lower rate of customs duties allowed under the Capitulations. By 1795, Sir Robert Liston, the ambassador, told the Company that he believed his predecessors had received between £2000 and £3000 a year for this, but we have no evidence that Kinnoull obtained income in this way.

Finally, any diplomat involved in the successful negotiation of a treaty between the Sublime Porte and other European powers could be richly rewarded. Sir Robert Sutton received 6000 ducats (about £2800) and a

sable coat from the Russian plenipotentiary for his part in the settlement of Russo-Turkish quarrels in 1712.¹¹⁹ Unfortunately for Kinnoull, no such opportunity arose during his tenure of office.

Despite all these possible sources of income, British ambassadors were indeed always short of money. Inflation within the Ottoman Empire meant that the value of their incomes declined, and since the 1730s were indeed a difficult time for trade in the eastern Mediterranean, the Company was unable to make any increase in its payments. After 1615 ambassadors were forbidden to trade on their own account so could not cover their costs by this means.

Many of Kinnoull's dispatches contain complaints about money. For instance, in 1732 he writes to Newcastle: 'If the King or the Levant Co. don't think proper in a little time to give the ambassador here three thousand pound sterling per annum in place of fourteen hundred pound, HM's ambassador must shut his doors and will make a very poor figure.'¹²⁰ Writing to Delafaye, Kinnoull says that his 'perquisites' since arrival have been no more than £300 sterling. The Imperial representative, Thalmann (a Resident, not a full ambassador) has £2000 a year and the French ambassador £5000, while the Dutch ambassador gets the same as he does.¹²¹

Kinnoull was quickly in dispute with the Levant Company over financial matters. In March 1731, the treasurer of the Levant Company in Constantinople received, from London, the following: 'This serves to advise you that His Excellency the Earl of Kinnoull having been a year at Constantinople we now order you to pay him the accustomed Gratuity of Dollars Two Thousand' (nearly £300).¹²² There was then a long-running argument with Kinnoull who had evidently budgeted for being paid his 'Gratuity' in England, which had apparently been arranged for Stanyan before him, something that did not suit the Levant Company.

Kinnoull attempted to persuade the Levant Company in London to give way on this by arranging for several of his creditors to send bills to them. Thus, on 10 May 1731, the merchant William Hanger presented a power of attorney for a Mr Andrew Drummond, goldsmith, of Charing Cross Road who wanted repayment of £1000 + £107 + £148 + £47. Kinnoull said he had told the Levant Company in London to pay £400 per annum to Drummond from his account.¹²³ By November they had given way as regards the payment of an initial 400 dollars (nearly £60) in London but said this would not be repeated.¹²⁴ Furthermore, they did not give way subsequently and at the end of 1735 the treasurer in Constan-

tinople was instructed to pay Kinnoull's last two years' gratuity (1733 and 1734) in Constantinople because they had repeatedly said it would not be paid in England as he wanted.¹²⁵

Costs were undoubtedly considerable. An ambassador had to pay to maintain his substantial household. For instance, Edward Wortley Montagu, ambassador from 1717 to 1718, took a staff of 20 liveried servants with him, as well as a chaplain and a surgeon.¹²⁶ This is in line with Kinnoull's statement that he took 20 men servants, as well as some women to work in the house.¹²⁷ The French ambassador Villeneuve took an escort of 100 men, but some of these were merely curious onlookers who later returned to France, and in any case the French ambassador was always well provided for financially by his government. In 1734 Kinnoull complained to Newcastle: 'In Christendom this Embassy is thought a very lucrative and easie employment ... [but] I have not bread for a dozen of servants which I have been obliged to reduce my family to but I hope that will be considered in a proper time.'¹²⁸ His successor Fawkener, complaining in 1744 about his inadequate salary of £1800, stated that he had to support 'a family [i.e. a household including servants] of at least 40 people' as well as 14 or 15 horses, while the cost of living was as bad as in London.¹²⁹

The household also contained a private secretary to be paid for by the ambassador; William Sandys accompanied Kinnoull from England in this role.¹³⁰ Although the post was apparently worth £300–400 per annum,¹³¹ Kinnoull complained that it was 'not worthwhile for a man of sense and probity to come from England to serve here under the Ambassador as secretary.'¹³² He said in 1734 that he had been his own secretary since he came, except for having an 'indifferent copyist'.¹³³

On the other hand, the Levant Company employed the *Cancellier* or company secretary: he 'recorded and preserved all the official business of the factory'.¹³⁴ Sandys, elevated from private secretary to *Cancellier* in 1730, had an apartment in the embassy, something that could cause difficulties. Kinnoull complained of Sandys's 'troublesome temper' and described how anyone holding the post of *Cancellier* was 'in the English Palace, living with the ambassador, dinning (*sic*) every day with him, always at his elbow, a continual spy upon him'.¹³⁵ This was an important post, though, because the *cancellier* ranked as the second person in the factory after the ambassador: he 'was accustomed to act as deputy or chargé d'affaires, when the ambassador was absent or ill, or in any interval caused by death'.¹³⁶ However, because the Company appointed him and

he received no commission from the King, the Crown had no power over him; thus, his position was even more anomalous than that of the ambassador.

The Levant Company also paid £115 per annum for a Company chaplain, one Mr Thomas Payne in Kinnoull's time. It was usual for the chaplain to live in the embassy as part of the 'family'; there is a special note of an exceptional allowance made to Mr Payne for living elsewhere for a period.¹³⁷ Services were celebrated in the chapel attached to the embassy. The chaplain was also the keeper of the Company library, something that seems to have been of interest to Samuel Medley, judging by his reading habits.¹³⁸

Every ambassador had a group of janissaries, or soldiers, who guarded him when he went out of the embassy compound. Kinnoull had six such janissaries paid for by the Company, while the Company treasurer had one. These guards were assigned by the Ottoman authorities partly to maintain the ambassador's rank, but also to protect him from being jostled or spat on in the street by any fanatical Muslim. Kinnoull commended his own janissaries as 'the trustyest fellows in the world.'¹³⁹

Then there were the dragomans or interpreters, which the Turkish authorities allocated but the Company employed. The British had nine of these, three principal dragomans who were 'the most important members of the native staff of the embassy', being the 'eyes, ears and mouth' of the ambassador,¹⁴⁰ and six *giovani di lingue*, or trainees. Another of the Company's Turkish employees (paid 20 dollars, about £2.18s a month) was the *scrivan effendi* who had the task of translating documents into Turkish when required.¹⁴¹

Entertaining other ambassadors and envoys was a considerable expense, but an essential one in the closed world of the Europeans in Constantinople where status and precedence were of paramount importance. Kinnoull did not hold back from this aspect of his job, which caused the Company in London some concern. The 1730–31 Levant Company account books¹⁴² show that 2000 dollars (nearly £300) was paid to Kinnoull every three months 'for entertainment' but the Company tried to exercise some control when this budget was overspent. For instance:

We find charged to our debt Dollars 38 [about £5.10s] for Entertaining the Venetian Secretary who came from Belgrade to see your Lordship which is not customary ... likewise ... Dollars

116 aspers 99 for Building a Bakehouse Dollars 103 aspers 81 [about £17 and £15 respectively] for repairing the Palace walls which we are Determined not to allow in regard of the large sums of money we so lately expended in that building & wherein your Excellency is so easily accommodated.¹⁴³

Also this: ‘We find \$230 [about £34] charged to our Debt for an Entertainment on the King’s Birth Day which not having been practis’d till the year 1730 We desire such entertainment may not be any more placed to our account.’¹⁴⁴ Whoever paid, Kinnoull had no intention of stopping celebrating the King’s Birthday. Samuel Medley’s diary entry for 29 October 1734 includes: ‘our palace full of cooks – for to morrows feast’ and, for 30 October, ‘King Georges Birth Day – viz K G the Second – the Dutch the Venetian the French – ambrs the moscovite – the German: the polland Envoy Dind wth my Lord, a Great & noble Entertainment.’ However, this battle had been given up by the next year, when on 30 October 1735 Medley simply says: ‘His ex-y dind at 6 K G-s Birthday.’ His Excellency did not forget his butler and other servants on these occasions; here is part of the diary entry for 30 October 1733: ‘King Georges Birth Day. My L^d sent from Bellgrade a present of Mutton to the family – and orders to drink the Best wine and to be Cheerfull & merry on the occasion – w^{ch} wee Did perform verry deacently In order &c.’

The battle over expenses continued throughout Kinnoull’s time and towards the end of 1734 the Levant Company in London complained that:

our expenses go on increasing very much ... exclusive of presents occasioned by the late Revolution and the changes that have since happened among the Ministers at the Porte, our expenses are increas’d during your Excellency’s Embassy at least \$2000 [about £300] a year and that these Exceedings arise from presents made to Turks at their earnest request ... and from extraordinary Dinners, Sweetmeats, Wine and mending of watches.

They would be asking His Majesty to bear some of the cost if Kinnoull cannot do better!¹⁴⁵

Oiling the wheels of the Turkish bureaucracy was essential. Sutton complained in May 1711 of ‘inconvenience and disadvantage ... by having no allowance of Charges either for intelligences or cultivating the

friendship of the Turks ... while others, and especially our Enemies are well supplied.'¹⁴⁶ Stanyan, Kinnoull and Kinnoull's successor, Everard Fawkener shared these sentiments. In February 1731, Kinnoull asked Newcastle to persuade the King to agree to an additional £500 per annum for intelligence gathering.¹⁴⁷ But he was still having to make similar complaints more than three years later: 'If His Majesty would ... allow me only Envoys pay that I might have a little money ... [for] intelligence, I would be able to do wonders at this Court.'¹⁴⁸

Presents were required from foreign representatives upon every major change of officials at the Porte, and there were many such changes in the 1730s. They were also required at major festivals such as the Little Bayram and Great Bayram celebrations. The Levant Company kept detailed records of all these gifts, which amounted to considerable sums; in December 1730 a total of 6628 dollars worth (a little under £1000) of presents were given 'to maintain and uphold the priviledges [*sic*] of the English Nation'. The range of items is staggering: pistols, gunpowder, powder horns, barometers, 'perspective glasses', spectacles, watches, clocks, china, glass, snuff boxes, mathematical instruments, brass fire irons, armchairs, chests, gilded wall sconces with mirrors, chocolate, olives, anchovies, Venice treacle, green tea and even 'English cheeses'. Flower bulbs were popular in the 1730s, with the Grand Vizier receiving 2000 double jonquil roots. All these were additional to the main items listed, which were lengths of English cloth of varying quality. The Venetian *bailo* also had at his disposal a collection of suitable presents called a *ragionateria*, which included robes of varying quality, lengths of cloth, watches, mirrors, cushions, canaries and glass items.¹⁴⁹

All the Frankish embassies would give presents such as these to the sultan, the grand vizier, the *reis efendi*, the *kizla aga* and the multitude of other officials when, for instance, a new sultan ascended the throne as in 1730. A Turkish military victory provided another occasion to give presents. In 1733 after a victory over the Persians, the Chief Dragoman to the Porte received 100 sequins from the French, a gold snuff box set with diamonds from Kinnoull and a gold watch and chain from the *bailo*, Angelo Emo.¹⁵⁰

Other information about various embassy costs comes from the Levant Company account books for Constantinople for the period from 1 December 1730 to 31 May 1731:¹⁵¹ Such cost headings included hiring men with livery to go with Lord Kinnoull to audience; boat hire for Lord

Kinnoull ‘& nation’; messengers (to and from palace); letters (for example His Excellency’s postage via Marseilles); dinners; ‘sweetmeats, sherbets & sugar’ prescribed to Turks; and ‘curagees’ (doormen) of various important Turks. We also find: ‘Account of presents made to Officers of Ottoman Port’ to maintain the privileges of the English nation when important officers changed at the Great Bayram: ‘broadcloths; gold watch to dragoman of Captain Pasha; gold repeater & chain to Reis Effendi; spectacles; mending watches for “great Turks”.’ Gifts and money were also required for bribing officials; for instance, after the Petrie affair, Kinnoull was obliged to disburse large amounts to those who had assisted him to resolve matters. The account book¹⁵² mentioned above reveals that William Hanger and James Jennings were paid expenses for their period of confinement; also several very costly watches had to be given to Porte officials. Kinnoull claims to have had to spend £500 of Levant Company money on ‘friends at Porte’ to sort out the affair.¹⁵³ However, there were grumbles about this from the Levant Company, London, copied to the Constantinople treasurer Maydwell.¹⁵⁴

A major aspect of Kinnoull’s contact with the Turks was concerned with trade matters and we should not underestimate the amount of time he had to spend on Levant Company business (for example, in a lawsuit between Pierre Lupart, English merchant at Aleppo, and Guez, Compe et Isouard, French merchants, in which Villeneuve also became involved, and in the case of Henry Lannoy Hunter, which also involved Guez).¹⁵⁵ Frequent letters were exchanged between the Company’s headquarters in Devonshire Square and the embassy over all manner of commercial and shipping issues. There were Company consuls in Smyrna, Aleppo and Salonika, but they were not always able to deal with major disputes involving other nationals. There were also examples of British ships being seized by pirates or by ships flying the flag of other nations so that the ambassador had to use diplomatic channels to try to resolve matters.

In addition to his efforts in these respects Kinnoull appears to have done what was expected of him as regards extending the hand of friendship and hospitality to the British merchants and Samuel Medley notes numerous occasions when they were his guests. For instance, on Sunday 18 November 1733 during ‘a verry Could Raney – uncomfortable Season – my L^d Extertaid – all y^c Merchants – but 2 Mr Pain Sr Pezazy &c. at Diner. A verry hansom Diner the Moscovit Residents vizited his Ex-y in the Evening.’ And then again on 25 December 1733:

Xmas Day Mr Paine & Some of the Merchants at Church – all the Merchants – Captin Lyle – & his other two Brothers – Baron Zy – Mr Paine & many other Gentⁿ Dind wth His Excellency – a verry Good Entertainment Both my feet much worse Sinne Morning – the Moscovite Resident vizited my Ld In ye Evening.

It must have been very irritating for the ambassador to know that all his arguments with the Company over pay and expenses, even the most trivial, were likely to become public knowledge among the merchants via the Constantinople treasurer, who was appointed on a two-year basis from their number.

There was also always potential for controversy over the Company's appointment of people who would be working with the ambassador, such as the *cancellier*, who kept all the Company registers and knew the details of trade, and the dragomans and giovani di lingua. The Company had been cooperative over the appointment, as *Cancellier*, of William Sandys, who travelled out with Kinnoull as his private secretary. However, in due course, Kinnoull fell out with him and forced him to resign. The ambassador then wanted Louis Monier, by then his personal secretary, as a replacement (which was an unfortunate choice though, as we shall see). The merchants, however, had other ideas and Kinnoull wrote to Newcastle that they wanted a 'bigoted Irish papist' called Herbert! Kinnoull regarded this as an affront to Protestants: His Majesty was protector of the 'poor Greek church' against the Jesuits and papist clergy. He saw a danger that Herbert would reveal secrets to the French, for, as *Cancellier*, he would be 'in the English Palace', living with the ambassador. In the end a compromise was made with the appointment of Henry Bland,¹⁵⁶ whom the Company sent out from England to take up the job, but this resulted in the need for a six-month interregnum with the merchant William Wallace as acting *Cancellier*.¹⁵⁷ According to Samuel Medley's entry of 12 November 1733, 'our new Cancellere [Mr Bland] came this Day – by way of France.' And after all that, Kinnoull wanted to sack Bland after only six months in the post, something the Company would not consider without hearing Bland's side of the story first.¹⁵⁸ He was still around in September the following year when Medley noted on 18 September 1734 that 'I walked to Both y^e Keeosks wth Mr Bland & Mr Clark.'

There were, however, occasional advantages to being a member of the Company – for instance, when the consul and merchants at Aleppo wrote to congratulate Kinnoull on the ending of the Petrie affair (and also to

refer various disputes regarding trade or Turkish subjects to him) they also said that ‘after long waiting and a continual search’ they had found him two horses, which were ‘humbly offered’ for his ‘favourable acceptance’.¹⁵⁹ When these arrived, Kinnoull sent the consul profuse thanks for them – ‘two of the finest horses I have seen in this country’, which had travelled 46 days by sea from Aleppo but arrived in very good condition, thanks to the groom.¹⁶⁰

Relations between Kinnoull and the Company were never easy. No doubt the merchants in both London and Constantinople were much relieved at the appointment of the next ambassador, Sir Everard Fawkener, a long-time member of the Levant Company, who knew what was involved in the Turkey trade.

4

Things Fall Apart

THE PERSIAN WAR

DESPITE THE distractions of the 1730 rebellion and its aftermath in Constantinople, the Turks continued to do battle with the Persians, under Nadir Shah, over the next few years. Kinnoull still tried to give Newcastle an accurate account of the Turkish-Persian war, but was of course handicapped by the Turks' over-optimism and propaganda, not to mention problems of translation. The British hope was that the war between Turkey and Persia would continue to distract the Turks from any intention to fight the Russians; hence that if there were to be a peaceful settlement, it should not be one which left the Turks feeling triumphant and keen for further successes.

On 11 August 1733, Kinnoull wrote reporting news of a victory by Osman Pasha over the Persians on 11 July. The Dragoman of the Porte had brought Kinnoull the news personally, but Kinnoull thought it likely to be much exaggerated in favour of the Turks. Canons at the Seraglio, arsenal and foundry had sounded off at 10 p.m. and again the next day in the morning, noon and the evening, for all the ships were in harbour.

It is believed that before winter the Grand Signior will order publick rejoicings to be made all over Constantinople for eight or ten days. ... Upon such an occasion every body keeps open house. There is nothing but eating and drinking all over this vast City day and night with a great din of Musick everywhere, and all night long all the houses and shops must be illuminated which they say is a very fine sight; but generally such publick rejoicings costs the frank nations very large presents to the Vizier and to the other great men of the Court.¹

Samuel Medley, whose diary did not start until October, noticed some further celebrations, justified or otherwise, on 7 November 1733: ‘Guns fired this morning Round the harbour – Rejoyceing (as we Supoos) upon Some News – from Persia.’ However, news was received on 23 November 1733 of Topal Osman’s rout and death.² In Medley’s words for that day:

news came again (about this time) that the Turks army – was Intirely Routed – & Scarce any Escaped – the Persians haveing an compleat victory – & Toppall ozman: their Generall killed. [On 7 December 1733, he updates this news with] Tis now talked y^t y^c Gd vizir is Goeing verry Speedaly wth a numerous army against y^c Persians.

In February 1734, Kinnoull tells Newcastle that ‘There have been ten thousand lyes spread here about the Turkish affairs in Persia, in order to amuse the people.’ He then attempts to give what he believes to be a true account, including that Tamas Kuli Khan (Nadir Shah) beat Osman Pasha (Topal Osman) and possibly had him beheaded, leading to a treaty, on which the Turks later reneged, signed by Tamas Kuli Khan and Ahmed Pasha.³

In January 1733, Kinnoull had reported to Newcastle that Tartar forces wanted to march through Russia to help Turkish forces in Persia and there had been a formal protest by Neplyuev.⁴ Kinnoull believed that when the Persian war was over the Turks would fight the Russians.⁵ According to Thalmann (and contradicting the official Porte account) there was in fact a Muscovite/Tartar encounter in about August 1733, in which the Muscovites were victorious, preventing the Tartars from the Crimea (80,000 of them, according to Kinnoull’s information) from crossing Russian territory to join in the Persian war against Tamas Kuli Khan.⁶ This was the sort of provocation most likely to cause the outbreak of a full-scale war between Russia and Turkey.

In the summer of 1735, ‘Tamas Kuli Kan was marched to give y^c Turks battle ... [and] the Persians obtained a great victory.’ Harrington concluded that ‘the Porte [would] have little inclination to provoke the Muscovites after having received such a defeat.’⁷ This resulted in the dismissal of the Grand Vizier Ali Pasha, or, as Samuel Medley picturesquely put it on 2 July 1735, ‘Tis now talked y^t y^c vizir is cut off – but Some Say Banished.’ In fact, he was given an honourable appointment as

Pasha of Candia (Crete). His replacement was Ishmael Pasha⁸ and, in due course, on 29 September 1735, ‘His Ex-y wth all of us his Retinue – vizedited the new vizir Ishmael Bashaw.’ However, the latter was, in his turn, replaced by the Grand Signor in December of the same year.⁹

These rapid changes of grand vizier presented obvious difficulties for ambassadors in that each one was likely to start with a new set of prejudices and needed to be wooed – and the costs of associated ceremonies and presents were substantial.

Although wars against the Persians continued intermittently until 1746, and the Turkish armies fought the Austrians and the Russians between 1736 and 1739, Mahmud’s reign was relatively stable. Kinnoull’s time as ambassador was over by the end of 1735; his successor Everard Fawkener assumed the responsibility of representing both the British government and the Levant Company. The initial part of his embassy was difficult, because of the 1736 to 1739 war between Russia and Austria on the one hand, and between Russia and Turkey on the other. However, things appeared so quiet after the peace made by the 1739 Treaty of Belgrade that Fawkener requested permission to return to England in 1742 and never went back to Constantinople. He was not formally replaced until 1746, with the chancellor of the Levant Company filling his post until the new ambassador arrived.¹⁰

THE WAR OF THE POLISH SUCCESSION

By the early 1730s French attitudes were changing under their able foreign minister Cardinal Fleury. The French King now had an heir and Fleury was increasingly concerned about the power of Austria. There are letters from Kinnoull to Newcastle in April and August 1731, in which he offers congratulations to His Majesty on the Treaty of Vienna with the Austrians. He notes that the French ambassador is expressing uneasiness at His Majesty’s success and Kinnoull says he is pleased that Fleury has been ‘overmatched’. He says that the English benefit from having better relations with the Turks, especially customs officials and *kadis*, that English trade prospects are improving and that it is most important ‘to preserve ourselves from the tricks of the French’.¹¹ Thus he has understood Walpole’s current stance, both in relation to Austria and as regards necessary caution over relationships with the French; it seems likely too that he has understood that Villeneuve is not to be underestimated.

In 1733 Fleury was presented with an ideal opportunity for a show-down with Austria. When Augustus II of Saxony, who was King of

Poland, died in that year, both Russia and Austria, its two powerful neighbours, wanted to ensure the succession of a friendly ruler. One candidate was Augustus's son, Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony, whom Russia and the Emperor favoured and who did, in fact, become King Augustus III in due course.¹² The other, the choice of most of the Polish nobles, was Stanislaus Leszczyński, father-in-law of Louis XV of France, who, in a move that France backed, was declared King of Poland in August 1733. When Russia invaded Poland to make Frederick Augustus of Saxony king, France, Spain and Savoy, backing Stanislaus, declared war on Austria, attacking on the Rhine. The French also tried to persuade the Sublime Porte to attack Russia while Muscovite troops were involved elsewhere, but without success. The Emperor 'appealed to England to honour her guarantee by the treaty of 1731 to protect his dominions if attacked. Walpole, however, on the flimsy pretext that [the States General] remained neutral, refused to honour the obligation.'¹³

Walpole continued to believe that negotiation could solve all problems, and he and the Dutch tried hard to bring the Emperor to the negotiating table during the War of Polish Succession. Any possibility of the Ottoman sultan invading Russia or Austria filled him with horror, and the dispatches to Kinnoull from the Duke of Newcastle, Secretary of State for the southern division, show this very clearly. The notion took hold that Kinnoull was favouring the French over the Russians and the Austrians, and he was repeatedly instructed to act in concert with the Dutch ambassador and to avoid showing any preference for the French. It was this notion that was the downfall of Kinnoull; whether it was an accurate depiction of his diplomatic activity or not is another matter. The Russians also believed that French foreign policy posed a direct threat to them, with Villeneuve, the French ambassador in Constantinople actively plotting with the Turks. Ostermann, the Russian foreign minister, stated in a letter to the British envoy at St Petersburg his belief 'that the French ambassador was actually [too] far advanced in his negotiations with the Porte to engage the Turks to attack this Court or that of Vienna'.¹⁴

Kinnoull observed to Newcastle that, on the old king's death, the Polish envoy in Constantinople had returned home leaving his nephew 'Staninsky' (actually Stadnicki) in charge. Kinnoull expressed concern that he was only 22 and likely to be influenced by the French ambassador who wanted Stanislaus as the new king.¹⁵ On 16 August, Kinnoull reported that Count 'Stadninsky' had received credentials (from Stanislaus) as Resident.¹⁶ The Grand Vizier pretended to be neutral but

did accept the credentials, gave Stadnicki a new larger house and increased his daily allowance.¹⁷

News of the war percolated down to Samuel Medley who writes on 23 October 1733 that ‘wee have news from y^e German & Dutch pallace – that Stanislaus the King of polland has abdicated – the Government – upon the approach of the Elector of Saxony – who is now Elected their King In his Room [i.e. in his place].’ Then, on 2 November 1733, he goes on to say that ‘We hear, now, that the french have proclamd open warr ag[ainst the] Emperour of Germany.’ In fact, the Russians chased Stanislaus to Danzig where he was besieged and the French tried to get the Ottomans to attack Russia while its troops were distracted there. The Russians, of course, wanted the Ottomans to remain neutral; the Austrians wanted this also and particularly wanted to be sure that Bonneval (operating somewhat independently of Villeneuve) did not persuade the Porte into aggression while Austria was distracted by its quarrel with France! In the face of all this complicated manoeuvring, the British and Dutch ambassadors were both told to frustrate Villeneuve. As we shall see, poor and worsening relations between Kinnoull and Calkoen, and, it would appear, distrust of Kinnoull’s attitude to Villeneuve by Thalmann and Neplyuev (whether or not justified), were major factors in Kinnoull’s eventual dismissal.

In relation to Kinnoull’s attitude to Villeneuve, it should be said that, when writing to Newcastle in the summer, he was expressing unreservedly strong concerns about Villeneuve’s activities. He wrote that he believed that Villeneuve had engineered a renewal of the Treaty of Passarowitz, between Venice and the Porte, in a form that would remove certain obligations of the Porte to the emperor. In fact, Angelo Emo, the Venetian *bailo*, was anxious to ensure that the treaty was renewed in full; the Turks tried to avoid this, which may well have been partly as a result of French pressure.¹⁸ Kinnoull wrote:

If France have a King of their own in Poland and can persuade the Venetians to play the same game with the Turks which the French do, we shall soon see a Turkish army upon the frontiers of Hungary. [He sees France as] in the middle of this affair. For they never are, nor never will be without projects of this nature, at this Court: and whoever in the end shall be the Dupes is not their concern, let them take care of themselves.¹⁹

In July, Kinnoull wrote: 'the French Amb continues his dayly & earnest Solicitations at the Porte, that they would interpose in the present Election in Poland in favour of King Stanislaus ... [and] The Fr Amb likewise does all he can to blow the coal betwixt the Porte and the Muscovites.'²⁰

Curiously, a false rumour of some magnitude reached Medley – from the French embassy, of all places. On 1 December 1733 'News Came from the french Pallace – that open warr was Proclaimd Between England & France – the Truth of w^{ch} story time will Discover.'

In December 1733, Kinnoull assured Robinson in Vienna that: 'I shall not fail to do everything here for the interest of His Imperial Majesty ... the Courts of Vienna and Dresden may entirely depend on my hearty assistance at the Court.'²¹

In relation to the Russians, Kinnoull claims, in February 1734, to have made progress, when in conference with the Grand Vizier about a month previously, in convincing the latter that the 'conduct of the Muscovites in Poland' should worry Turkey much less than the French had encouraged him to think it should.²² In March he said, again, that the French were encouraging the Turks to make war on the Muscovites but he believed that they would not get far until after the war with Persia was concluded. He said that he would have an audience with the Grand Vizier Ali Pasha on 20 April, as would Calkoen, and he stressed that he was still telling the Grand Vizier to take a more favourable view of the Russians and not to listen to the French. He also expressed concern that, without instructions from home, he had to use his initiative too much: 'It will be a great comfort to me to hear from your Grace that my conduct is approved. ... A blindman may hit a mark but the odds are too great against him.'²³

However, he had to wait until at least September to receive, from Newcastle, a letter dated 20 August saying that he has 'His Majesty's entire approbation' for all he is doing to prevent 'the Porte from coming to a Rupture with the Czarina' and 'in keeping the Port in as good a disposition as possible towards the Emperor & in hindering them from concerning themselves in the present disputes in Europe'.²⁴ He had reassurance from the Russian ambassador himself in June:

Mr Neplueff ... affects to be mightily pleased with the Vizier and his kind reception and returned me a thousand thanks for my good offices. ... I have not been able to find out if he has hid any part of his conference from me. But if there was any secret in his audience I shall know of it in a few days.²⁵

However, there sounds to be an element of distrust here, which was probably justified, as we shall see.

Whatever the exact nature of the balancing act Kinnoull was trying to perform, it seems perhaps naïve of him to have welcomed Count Stadnicki, envoy of the French-backed King Stanislaus, into his company with as much enthusiasm as he did from the end of May 1734 onwards. Whenever they were both living at Belgrade village, they dined together frequently in each other's houses, as Medley notes (though he identifies Stadnicki as 'Staninski' or, more often, 'Kininsky' or 'Kinsky'). For instance, on Thursday 25 July 1734, he writes 'I walked to y^e fountain & B[owling] Green His Ex-y m-m [Madam] & y^e family [the household] Returnd from pera & Supt wth y^e Count Kininsky in y^e other village' and on the next day, Friday 26 July 1734, 'Count Kininsky Dind wth his Ex-y.' People were bound to notice and question his motives.

In July Kinnoull writes to Robinson that:

some of our good friends here are very jealous of me because I will not break with the French ambassador. ... I shall act steddily & solidly for His Imperial Majesty's interest in this court. ... [I]n our Frank quarter ... we are surrounded with a crowd of the most awful spys in the world.²⁶

This last outburst is, however, related to the apparently bland observation in a letter to Newcastle in July that 'Mr Antonio Pisani my second dragoman about a fortnight ago ... quitted the service.'²⁷ Kinnoull was more informative at the 'Assembly of y^e English Factory at Constantinople' on 12 July when:

HE told the Gentlemen that ... Mr Antonio Pisani ... had ... quitted the service ... in such a manner that it was neither consistent with HE's honour nor with the nature of so delicate a Trust as that of a Dragoman to employ [him] any longer either in His Majesty's affairs or those of the Levant Company.²⁸

We look further, later in this chapter, at the particular treachery involved, but Kinnoull felt sufficiently let down to sigh to Newcastle: 'As for the execution of the duty of an Ambassador here, it is the most disagreeable Employment in the World. He must trust his Dragoman with

his secrets and with the entire management of his affairs who ... carries the Ambassador's messages and brings what answers he pleases.²⁹

Medley continues to keep track in his diary of the situation in Poland, writing, on 6 June 1734: 'about this time an Express from y^e french palace to Cont Kinisky here in y^e villa – that y^e french had Raysd y^e Seige of Danzik & kill 40000 moscovites' and, a page later opposite the 16 June 1734 entry, 'about this time cam an Express from Mr Tallman – the Quite Revers of the former news about Danzik.' On 10 July 1734 he mentions that 'the news Reachd hither that y^e Duke of Berwicks head was Shott off by a cannon Ball – at phillipsburge – & that marishall villars died in his way (towards france) from y^e camp' and about five weeks later, on 22 July 1734, 'about this time news came to the muscovite Resident – that K Stanislaus – was taken prisoner – by the muscovite Generall before Danzick or delivered up by the Inhabitants of the Citty But since we here he made his Escape before the Citty was taken – or capitulated.'

In fact, when Russia invaded Poland, Stanislaus fled to Danzig, which fell to the Russians on 2 July 1734. He fled to Konigsberg from where he directed guerrilla warfare against the new king and the Russians until given Lorraine by the Treaty of Vienna in 1738.³⁰ As for the Duke of Berwick (1670–1734), he was a bastard son of James II, was naturalized a Frenchman in 1703 and had a most distinguished military career, being in command of the French forces on the Rhine when, in June 1734, at the age of 64, in the trenches at Philippsbourg and exposed to fire from both sides, he was indeed beheaded by either an Austrian or a French cannon ball.³¹

Then, on 30 September 1734, Medley writes: 'News Came this moring that the Germans had Beat the french army in Ittaly Killd 7000 & taken an 100 Cannon – & 6000 prisoners wth all the Camp Bagg Baggage &c.' In fact there was much fighting in Italy where, in due course, the Spanish, in alliance with the French, took the opportunity to remove the Austrians from Naples, installing the Bourbons instead.

Newcastle wrote to Kinnoull in October 1734 saying that the States General had resolved to send Calkoen further instructions to prevent 'rupture with the Emperor at the instigation of the French ambassador'; Kinnoull was urged to greater efforts also: 'His Majesty will be greatly disappointed if you do not exert yourself as much as possible' in this direction.³² Horace Walpole reported to Robinson in November 1734 that the States General had sent a formal complaint to France to the effect that the French ambassador in Constantinople had been trying to cause

rupture between the Turks and the Empire or Russia. France denied this but pointed out that, by the Treaty of Pruth, the Muscovites had agreed 'never to march any forces into Poland'.³³

For Kinnoull, communications continued to be a very serious difficulty. Back in March 1733 he asked Robinson to forward his letter to Newcastle and, throughout 1733 and 1734, there were sundry occasions when he asked him to forward packets and communications as well – to Delafaye in England, to Skinner in Florence and to Finch in Sweden.³⁴ He heard from London that all his letters via Thalmann's courier in the previous December had been opened and resealed with the Emperor's seal – not only the main packet but also individual letters. He asked Robinson if he could stop this happening.³⁵ As he told him: 'We live here in such darkness that lights, upon certain occasions from you, will not only put a very great obligation upon me, but will likewise be of great use & guidance to me in the service.'³⁶

By September a further interview with the Grand Vizier, in which he again says he has tried to give him a balanced view favouring the Russians more and the French less, has persuaded Kinnoull that 'most of the Vizier's present notions come from Bonneval who is much with him and in high favour; he has made him a Pasha with two tails, with a very large pension.'³⁷

Soon afterwards 'The Supreme Vizier Ali Passaw', whom Kinnoull regarded as 'a first minister of great prudence, wisdom and penetration', wrote a letter to the King of England 'whose great glory is to be a peacemaker'.³⁸ The letter asked the King to bring pressure on the Russians. He wanted Kinnoull to have it delivered but 'he told me that he expected that I would not give the least hint of the present letter, which he wrote to the King, to any Minister of any Power whatever at the court and conjured me to the strictest secrecy in the matter' (until he had received His Majesty's answer).³⁹ To Newcastle, Kinnoull expressed his worries about routes for dispatches to and fro and particularly about this letter from the Grand Vizier to the King: 'I send with this dispatch one of my young Dragomans Sigr Giacomo Riso a Greek.' He planned at this stage to send him via Venice to avoid Vienna (but later changed plan). His problem was the secrecy with which the Grand Vizier had entrusted him because, as he put it:

all my letters as well as those of the other Ministers from this Court are Examined at Vienna, where there are persons that understand

the English very well, and if any letters are wrot in cipher they give such jealousie at that Court that they are never sent forward but destroyed.⁴⁰

In November 1734 he writes that: ‘Mr Giacomo Riso ... set out ... 18th October ... by land by way of Venice and Paris.’ He hoped the letters might arrive about the end of December.⁴¹ When Riso did deliver his letter in mid-January, he was not able to take back a quick reply: on 12 March he was appealing to a Mr Crowe: ‘Sr, Having had the honour to bring a packet from the Earl of Kinnoull ... to his Grace the Duke of Newcastle I have been here since the 17th of January waiting his Grace’s orders.’ He asked Crowe to intercede to get him some subsistence.⁴² But he had to wait until mid-May to convey the following from Newcastle to Kinnoull:

You will acquaint the Vizier that his Majy has received with pleasure the Assurances of His Disposition to maintain and improve the good understanding between the King & the Porte but as that Minister’s letter to his Majy contains many weighty Points, which require very mature Consideration, there has not been yet sufficient time to prepare an answer to them.⁴³

This letter, which presumably arrived sometime in late June 1735, was Newcastle’s first letter to Kinnoull since one dated 19 November 1734, which meant that, before receiving it, Kinnoull had had no replies to any of his letters from 21 September 1734 onwards, in other words for about nine months!

Meanwhile, on 12 October 1734, Kinnoull wrote of further discussions with the Grand Vizier in which he had tried to boost Russian interests against the intentions of Bonneval. He was highly complimentary about the role of his ‘Druggerman’ Luca Chirico,⁴⁴ whose story we look at separately, later in this chapter.

But an unknown person had stabbed Kinnoull in the back and there was a letter already on its way from Newcastle, written on 8 October 1734, saying that the King had received ‘from a very good hand at Constantinople’ news of a plot involving Kinnoull, the French ambassador and the Grand Vizier. It was suggested that the French were negotiating with Prussia and Sweden to attack the Emperor; Ragotski and Bonneval were apparently involved and they wanted the Turks to join in

the attack. Newcastle was surprised that Kinnoull had told him nothing about this; he had to impress upon the Grand Vizier the dangers of these plots and must act in concert with the Dutch ambassador. The 'very good hand' claimed that 'besides several visits which [the French ambassador] has made the Grand Vizier, the Dragoman of the Porte is almost every night upon business with His Exy till midnight and sometimes till morning.' Newcastle told Kinnoull that 'The King has had information from several hands that you live in the greatest Intimacy with the French ambassador.' Newcastle had thought that unlikely, but advised Kinnoull to make a lot of effort to persuade the Turks not to side with the French in attacking the Emperor. Newcastle noted, however, that the Imperial government had commended Kinnoull for his help.⁴⁵

Kinnoull replied with a long letter 'for my own justification and security against a combination of wicked and malicious people' and sent it with Riso, along with letters of 21 September and 12 October.

It may well be that the seeds of doubt the 'very good hand', whose identity remains a mystery, had sown in the King's mind found fertile ground in which to grow, in that the King would not have forgotten the suspicions of past years that Kinnoull might have had secret Jacobite and hence French sympathies, in line with others in his family. There were other dimensions to the Jacobites' interests in the outcome of the War of Polish Succession, especially in relation to Prince James Sobieski, father-in-law of James III, who supported the French candidate Stanislaus Leszczyński.⁴⁶

We shall look further at the King's suspicions and their consequences later in this chapter, but meanwhile it is worth noting that the French Cardinal Fleury, ably aided by Villeneuve, achieved a remarkably good result for France in the long run. A strengthened France imposed a peace on a weakened Austria in 1735, which involved their gaining Naples and Sicily; they were also able to insist that Lorraine went to Stanislaus in compensation for loss of the Polish throne, with the proviso that it would revert to France on his death. Furthermore, England's failure to come to the Empire's rescue resulted in its loss of Austria as an ally and when it came to war between England and Spain in 1739, England found itself 'without an ally or even a friend in Europe'⁴⁷. France and Russia broke diplomatic relations in 1735, and in 1736, the Russians, on the pretext of Tartar incursions, declared war on the Turks. There was a secret agreement with the Empire over potential spoils of war – Azov and the Crimea for Russia; Bosnia and

Herzogovina for the Empire – but neither the Russians nor the Austrians made good progress.⁴⁸ By this time Sir Everard Fawkener was British ambassador to the Porte. He and the Dutch ambassador Calkoen did their best to act as mediators, but were completely outplayed by Villeneuve who, much concerned to avoid any possibility of the Austrians and Russians defeating the Turks with consequent loss of French Levant trade, most skilfully brokered the treaty of Belgrade in 1739; this was very favourable to the Turks, restoring to them almost all territories that Austria had gained by the treaties of 1699 and 1718, and hence very favourable to French interests at the Porte.

A SWEDISH SIDESHOW

After his defeat by Peter the Great in 1709, Charles XII of Sweden fled to Ottoman territory from where he ruled his country as best he could until 1715. His admission to asylum demonstrated the common interest felt by the Turks and the Swedes in the face of Russian expansion, which strengthened further after the 1721 Treaty of Nystadt when Russia took control of the Baltic States.

In 1730, Newcastle had written to Kinnoull: ‘you should do the Crown of Sweden all the good offices in your power at the Porte’ on account of ‘a Disappointment which has prevented the King of Sweden from sending an ambassador to the Grand Senior’⁴⁹. (The so-called ‘disappointment’ had in fact been the death of the Comte de Reensterne,⁵⁰ apparently the prospective ambassador.) Thus, Kinnoull had good reason to believe it appropriate to be well disposed towards the Swedes.

On 28 March 1734 Medley writes that ‘Two young Gentlemen from Smyrna (Sweeds) Dind ... and Came to Lodge here haveing been traveling for Several years.’ Five days later, on 2 April 1734, he adds: ‘one ... is a Barron his name Hopkins: the other ... Seems to be Gardian or tutor.’ He notes that they dined at the German palace on 5 April, at the Muscovite palace on the 6th and at the Dutch ambassador’s on the 15th; joined Kinnoull’s visits to the Grand Vizier on the 17th and then to the ‘Capⁿ Basshaw’ on 1 May. By 21 April Medley has identified the ‘gardian or tutor’ as Mr Carleson. One or other or both Swedes receive a mention in the diary on 45 different occasions between their arrival on 28 March and 15 July, and they were house guests for most of that period, either at Pera or Belgrade. They were evidently made very welcome, frequently dining in and dining out in embassy circles, sometimes in the company of English

merchants, as well as attending ‘Chappel’ and joining sightseeing excursions. On 2 May 1734:

His Ex-y – the 2 Sweeds Gentⁿ & many of of us of my L^ds retinue – went Stambol Erly in y^e morning viz by 3 a clock – to Se the Grand Senr pas in grand Show to St Sophia Moskee – & after that fine show – wee went by boats to Sattabat & returnd by watter towards Evening a very fine Spasa [excursion].

At Belgrade village there were opportunities for walking, riding and fishing, as well as socializing. On Thursday 9 May ‘My L^d Barron Hopkins M^r Carlson &c. Rid a Spasso towards y^e Black Sea Returnd after three’ and on 15 May 1734 ‘His Ex-y M[ada]m Mrs S[and]ys Mr Carlson &c. went a fishing to y^e Keeosk after diner.’ During all this period, Kinnoull never mentioned the presence of the Swedes when writing to Newcastle, but the news evidently reached London from another source because Newcastle wrote to Kinnoull on 20 August: ‘two Swedeish Gentlemen, Monsr Hopken (son of the President of the College of Commerce at Stockholm) and Monsr Carlson ... are not at Constantinople altogether for their own diversion.’ Kinnoull was told to be on his guard, to try to find out their intentions, and to act with ‘that privacy, prudence & caution which you have hitherto observ’d thro’ your whole conduct’.⁵¹ In his reply to Newcastle in November, Kinnoull claimed: ‘I had spies upon them all the time they were here,’ but he said that he found they had no dealings with the Ministry of the Porte. He thought that Carleson had been sent to see if it was worth sending a Swedish minister to the court and that Hopken was a blind to give the impression they had come only for diversion. He said that ‘Carlson is 29 and Hopken only 23’ (he was actually 21).⁵² He believed they went home via Venice and Hamburg.⁵³

But Kinnoull had indeed been deceived – or else he knew more than he was telling Newcastle. When Edvard Carleson and Carl Fredrik von Höpken left Sweden for the Mediterranean in May 1732, they were both under instructions from the Swedish Board of Trade (the *kommers-kollegiet*). Carleson had previously travelled extensively in Europe; he had particular admiration for the Dutch attitude to life and particular interest in the economics of Holland and France. If the trip had educational intent (von Höpken’s father financed it) it was also hoped that it would provide commercial opportunities. By the beginning of

1734, however, when the pair was nearing Constantinople, there were broader issues of foreign policy interesting the Swedish first minister, Arvid Horn, for which the presence of Carleson and von Höpken was convenient. Given the situation in the War of the Polish Succession (see *The war of the Polish succession* in Chapter 4), France was as interested as were both Sweden and Turkey to contain Russian expansion and Horn had received overtures from the French: Villeneuve had realized that the only way to get round France's inability to sign a treaty directly with Turkey would be to engineer matching treaties between Turkey and Sweden and between France and Sweden.⁵⁴ Cardinal Fleury had particular religious motives for not wishing to sign an overt treaty with Turkey.⁵⁵

Carleson and von Höpken therefore became quickly involved in discussions with Villeneuve and Zaid Effendi (effectively the Turkish foreign minister who had visited Sweden previously).⁵⁶ The Swedes left Villeneuve in no doubt about the extent of their hatred of the Russians and of their desire to regain provinces lost to Russia.⁵⁷

The Swedes also had discussions with General Bonneval who, as a military tactician in the employ of Turkey, saw a treaty between the Porte and France as essential to mustering the Turks and Tartars against Russia. Villeneuve was under instructions to have no direct dealings with Bonneval and it appears that the Swedes acted as their go-between, while, according to Villeneuve, Kinnoull's secretary Louis Monier maintained contact between the Swedes and Bonneval.⁵⁸ As we shall see in the section on *Louis Monier* below, Kinnoull eventually dismissed Monier, ostensibly for disloyalty over other issues, but there must be speculation about the extent of Kinnoull's awareness of the Swedes' liaisons. Obviously, it was important to Sweden that Carleson and von Höpken should initially appear to be little more than enquiring tourists and it was in this disguise that they seem to have come to stay with Kinnoull and to socialize widely. Bonneval was particularly anxious about secrecy and believed that the Swedes' audience with the Grand Vizier should take place outside the capital, as if by coincidence, so as not to attract attention.⁵⁹

The Grand Vizier was persuaded to write to Arvid Horn to encourage ties with the Ottoman Empire that would take account of Charles XII's debt: Villeneuve and Bonneval were to a large extent at one over this, even though, in general, Bonneval was inclined to encourage the Turks to do nothing for France unless rewarded with a proper alliance.⁶⁰

Walpole was to some extent aware of the Swedish–French liaison with a view to establishing trading links, but in the back of his mind will doubtless also have been the memory of the Swedish–Jacobite conspiracy of 1717. Atterbury, the Bishop of Rochester, had been involved in raising money for an invasion from Sweden and had appealed to Kinnoull’s (then Dupplin’s) father-in-law, Lord Oxford, among others. The conspiracy had roughly coincided with Dupplin’s release from the Tower of London, where he had been held on suspicion of involvement in the rebellion of 1715.⁶¹

Further speculation about the Swedes’ intentions may be found in correspondence between Secretary of State, Lord Harrington, and Rondeau (in St Petersburg), the latter quoting Finch, writing from Sweden. Rondeau writes that ‘Her Majesty (the Czarina) would be very glad if the King would ... persuade the Court of Sweden not to send any Minister to Constantinople at this time ... but (if they must) ... it should not be Mr Rudenschild for fear he should joyn with the French ... to persuade the Turks to assist King Stanislaus.’⁶² Harrington replies:⁶³ ‘Mr Finch ... writ ... Rudenschild has indeed been named to go to Constantinople.’

Extracts of Mr Finch’s letters are given below:

4 December 1734

The King of Sweden’s choice would not fall on Mr Hopken’s son ... the Secret Committee have since been at work that the young gentleman should be sent thither without character or credentials but only to correspond from thence for the information of this Court.⁶⁴

11 December 1734

The Secret Committee have resolved that young Hopkens in the quality of Agent shall with his Companion Carlson immediately return to Constantinople pro interim.⁶⁵

25 December 1734

Mr Rud ... [is] named ... Minister to y^e Ottoman Porte but his departure ... [is] distant ... in the meantime young Hopkens & Carlson will go thither’.⁶⁶

12 March 1735

that Gentleman’s [Rud’s] mission ... [is] distant if not unlikely ... at

all since Mr Hopken would do all he could to secure his Son in that post.⁶⁷

In May 1735 Kinnoull reported that von Höpken and Carleson were back. In fact, they had cut short their return home while in Venice awaiting instructions.⁶⁸ It emerged that Zaid Effendi, having special bargaining power in relation to Sweden in connection with a large loan from the Grand Signor to Charles XII 'in his time of distress when he was in this country', had set things in motion two years before. Kinnoull believed that the French had been doing everything in their power to get the Swedes to send a minister to Constantinople with a view to strengthening a Swedish–Turkish–French alliance. Von Höpken and Carleson said they had orders to be friendly to everyone but they seemed to favour the French. An envoy extraordinary was anticipated from Sweden. 'They have taken a very handsome house here in which Mr Thalmann the German Resident lived before he was married and have furnished it very handsomely ... they have brought a great number of servants with them from Venice. ... They are very pretty young gentlemen.'⁶⁹

Despite noting that they favoured the French, Kinnoull continued to befriend them as before. For example, on 6 October 1735 'Bar[o]n Hop[kin]s & Mr Carlson dind wth His Ex-y – on their Return from y^c vizirs' and on 25 October 1735 'My L^d dind at the Sweeds palace – B-n Hop-s & Mr Carlson Supt wth his Ex-y.' It will now be evident that Kinnoull's naïve (if so it was) willingness to act so enthusiastically as host to von Höpken and Carleson, not to mention Stadnicki, is likely to have raised suspicions in the minds of Neplyuev and Thalmann and may well have contributed to the story of a supposed plot involving Kinnoull, the French and the Porte. Indeed, in August Kinnoull said that von Höpken and Carleson had got the Porte to agree to a Treaty of Commerce between Turkey and Sweden and that they awaited powers from home to conclude it – this was supposed to have been kept secret from Kinnoull, who by then knew that Bonneval was involved.⁷⁰ In fact, the agreement soon bore fruit and by the end of 1736 the Levant Company was 'sorry to observe that the Swedes are beginning a Cloth trade as part of their exports to Turkey'. But they could not say 'whether the Cloth which is made at Aix la Chapelle is wrought up with Our English Wool or not. [However] ... it will add to the melancholy prospect' of the French doing better in cloth exporting.⁷¹

Von Höpken remained in Constantinople until 1742 and Carleson stayed there three years longer. Respectively, they married Petronella and Klara, the daughters of the Dutch treasurer in Constantinople, Peter Leytstar.

THE DRAGOMANS LUCA CHIRICO AND ANTONIO PISANI

Luca Chirico had been first dragoman at the British embassy since Sir Robert Sutton's time and 'is allowed by everybody here to be one of the most able that ever went to the Port'.⁷² The Chirico family, originating from Ragusa, was one of the long-established dragoman families in Constantinople.⁷³ A year and a half before Kinnoull's arrival he had fallen out of favour with the *Chehaia*, ostensibly because the Porte had put duties on cotton and cloth, which were unpopular with the Frankish nations, and Luca, as the ringleader of dragomans of various nations that made representations to the *Chehaia*, was blamed. They were received with 'rauge and angry countenance' and Luca was banned from court. Stanyan took up his case without success and Luca went away to England with Stanyan.⁷⁴ Kinnoull also tried to intervene, but unsuccessfully; the *Chehaia* had apparently issued death threats.⁷⁵

Kinnoull suspected that there was more to the matter, for he told Delafaye that Luca was a good dragoman 'but if he is not watched he is a dangerous one'. Stanyan, being inclined to laziness, had trusted him too much.⁷⁶ He believed that Luca had done harm to English interests with both the Turks and 'our factory'.⁷⁷ It may well be relevant to subsequent events that, according to Kinnoull, Calkoen owed Luca money and had refused to pay up. Kinnoull had taken Chirico's part, registering his complaint over a debt of 1000 leoni, which Chirico had apparently spent on behalf of the widow of the previous Dutch ambassador, Collyer. There was much correspondence on this.⁷⁸

However, despite his belief that the man needed watching, Kinnoull was desperate for an experienced and competent dragoman and wanted Luca back; he believed the new government would accept this.⁷⁹ The Levant Company concurred:

Sign Luca Chirico being now upon his departure [from England] ... all possible regard has been shown by us to yours and your predecessors testimonials of his good behaviour ... and of his suffering from y^e persecutions of y^e ministers & persuade ourselves that the Reception he has met here will encourage him to a more

than ordinary zeal and application in our service. ... We trust your Excellency will immediately employ him.⁸⁰

Luca arrived back in November 1731, bearing a letter from Newcastle, and Kinnoull became increasingly delighted with and reliant on his services.⁸¹ However, he displaced Antonio Pisani, who had been acting first dragoman, to second place, which the latter evidently much resented, as we shall see later.

Before Kinnoull's time, Pisani had been introduced to the embassy through the Levant Company merchant Lisle as a replacement for the old dragoman, Andronico Gerarchi.⁸² The Pisani family, originating from Chios and Venetian Crete in the 1660s, was another of the great dragoman families of Constantinople.⁸³ Eventually, however, in 1734, Pisani appeared to have been involved in breaking confidences and Kinnoull forced his resignation. To Newcastle, Kinnoull wrote, making no mention at this stage of any suspicion he may have had over leaked confidential matters:

Mr Antonio Pisani my second dragoman about a fortnight ago ... quitted the service ... [he was] only good for common affairs[,] had no head for matters of difficulty and no sort of way or interest with the great Turks in both of which Mr Luca excells. ... Mr Luca is certainly one of the ablest dragomans in the world. ... It is true he is of a very high spirit and something of an overbearing temper but ... sees himself obligd to observe a more regular and subordinate conduct than he practised in Mr Stanyan's time.

Kinnoull mentioned jealousies and hatred between Pisani and Luca ever since Luca returned from England. In a postscript he described the letter of resignation from Pisani as 'insolent' and 'all the nonsense of a distempered brain'.⁸⁴ In fact, the letter from Pisani, which is in French, is strong – in other words he feels slighted and wronged – but it is not impolite.⁸⁵

The reaction of the Levant Company, having received both Kinnoull's complaint against Pisani and Pisani's version, was hardly supportive:

As this man was educated in a great measure at our Charge, has already been, and may be a useful servant to us hereafter, we have resolved to interpose our good offices in his behalf and accordingly

do desire your Excellency will continue him under your Protection and in his office of second Dragoman.⁸⁶

Kinnoull, who felt some compassion for Pisani, ‘a Greek of the Latin church who has family here and is a Turkish subject’,⁸⁷ replied: ‘According to your desire I have continued Mr Antonio Pisani & his Family under his Majys protection & he [continues to receive] the salary of 2nd Dragoman.’ Nonetheless, Kinnoull pointed out that he could no longer make use of him.⁸⁸

Luca, however, could do no wrong as far as Kinnoull was concerned. Indeed, in connection with interviews with the Grand Vizier in which Kinnoull claimed to be trying to counter Bonneval’s influence, he told Newcastle that: ‘Sigr Luca has behaved throughout this whole affair like an Angel, with that Fidelity, assiduity & skillfull management that he is at present the darling of the Turkish ministers, as he likewise justly deserves the greatest praise from me as well as from our Court.’⁸⁹

LOUIS MONIER

Kinnoull insisted, to the Levant Company, that Louis Monier should replace Sandys as his secretary when the latter ‘resigned’. Monier was Swiss, a native of Berne and a ‘relation of Col. Guises in the footguards’,⁹⁰ who had in all probability introduced him to Kinnoull in the first place. He had travelled out with Kinnoull,⁹¹ presumably in some junior secretarial capacity, and had become friendly with de Saussure.⁹²

Kinnoull asked him to carry the Grand Signor’s and Grand Vizier’s letters to the King in England, following the new ambassador’s audiences.⁹³ Sandys (who was jealous of this) described him disparagingly, in a letter to Delafaye, as ‘a gentleman of the horse’.⁹⁴

Wanting Monier to be well-received and to get the ‘usual present’ for delivering the letters, Kinnoull hinted to Newcastle that: ‘I believe £500 sterling has been given formerly upon the like occasion.’⁹⁵ We do not know whether the hint was taken, but the Levant Company came up with a rather smaller amount: ‘We have given to Mr Monier your secretary a present of Fourty Pounds in regard to your Excellency’s Recommendation of him to us.’⁹⁶

Monier then remained out of the news, with respect to Kinnoull’s letters, for the next two years, but Samuel Medley’s diary entry for Saturday 29 June 1734 includes some unexpected news of him: ‘I walked 3 times to y^c fountain & B[owling] green – & wth Mr Clark & Billy Mr

Monere Returnd from pera – & we here he has Left my L^ds service.’ Eventually, in October 1734, there was a long letter to Newcastle ‘for my own justification and security against a combination of wicked and malicious people’. Kinnoull claimed that Louis Monier (‘my late secretary’) had indulged in ‘treacherous projects’ and had been much in contact with Bonneval and ‘friendships ... among the Turks’ from which he was making money. Kinnoull had sacked him and tried to get him out of the country, but Monier was set upon revenge. Monier had been plotting with Calkoen and Pisani to have Kinnoull recalled – Calkoen being jealous of Kinnoull’s influence both at the Porte and over Thalmann and Neplyuev.

Kinnoull claimed that it was Calkoen who told Vienna and St Petersburg that he was in with the French; he also claimed that Calkoen had told the Turks that Kinnoull was being bribed by the Russians. Pisani had undertaken to get ‘some of the young men at the Factory to ... blacken my private character (in England)’. Kinnoull said that Monier undertook ‘to invent proper and probable lys with regard to my publick character [and] private life ... to be wrot to England and Vienna and Petersburg’. Monier hoped to be secretary to the next ambassador and Pisani hoped to be his dragoman. Monier, he said, now ‘makes ... the figure of a Spy for the Turks under Dutch protection’. Kinnoull said that Calkoen had also suggested to Finch, the British Resident in Sweden whom he had known previously in Holland, that he or one of his brothers should put in for the job as Kinnoull’s replacement. Kinnoull defended both himself and Luca, ‘the ablest servant in Turkey’.⁹⁷

The timing of news of a quarrel between Kinnoull and Calkoen was most unfortunate. In May Newcastle had written to Waldegrave, ambassador to France, that ‘His Majesty being desirous to act in the most perfect Concert with the States General ... in this present situation of affairs, looking upon their Interest as inseparable from his own’; he had sent Mr Walpole to confer with them to restore peace for the ‘preservation of a due Balance of Power in Europe’ and wrote that ‘it is necessary that there should be most intire Harmony and good Correspondence between their Ministers in the several courts.’⁹⁸

In November Walpole wrote to Kinnoull to the effect that he believed Kinnoull was trying to work with Calkoen but that he had heard there had been problems, for example over dragomans; he advised Kinnoull to forget the past and emphasized the need to work in ‘perfect concert’ with Calkoen.⁹⁹ The States General also impressed upon Calkoen, whom they

well knew was not slow to fall out with other ambassadors, the need 'to show all possible indulgence as far as compatible with your character' in his dealings with Kinnoull (and also, in connection with a complaint from Villeneuve, 'to act with all possible moderation' when dealing with the Frenchman).¹⁰⁰

Newcastle, writing in November before receiving Kinnoull's October letter, ticked him off for not writing often enough, instructed him ('HM's positive commands') to act in strictest concert with Thalmann and Calkoen, and told him to prevent the Porte rupturing with the Emperor or Czarina. There was also a warning to Kinnoull from Horace Walpole, doubtless tipped off by his brother Sir Robert, that he must make a special effort to get on with Calkoen; 'friendly relations between ministers of different courts [are] essential.'¹⁰¹ Too late, he warned that 'Mr Monier ... has been gained by the opposite party' and must be sacked as soon as possible and great care must be taken over the successor.¹⁰²

In two subsequent letters, still written before hearing from Kinnoull, Newcastle said he had received strong warnings about 'Luca Cherico ... who is represented to be entirely under the influence of the French ambassador at Constantinople, to spend great part of his time in company with that Minister, and in general to keep up a strict correspondence and intercourse with him'. Newcastle claimed that this was bound to upset the ambassadors of other powers and to reduce Kinnoull's influence with the Grand Vizier. Kinnoull was to make enquiries and, if not entirely satisfied, Luca would have to go.¹⁰³ Newcastle evidently had doubts about the stories he had received and, as a result, was now much less definite about Luca being sacked.

However, at the end of October Newcastle's colleague Harrington wrote that 'the King was very much pleased ... that [Kinnoull's] representation at the Port had been of so signal service to the Emperor, as is acknowledged by your Court.'¹⁰⁴ And on 23 November Rondeau, in St Petersburg, was still writing to Harrington that:

At present this Ministry is convinced that My Lord Kinnoull has done & continues to do all he is able to prevent the French Ambassador's engaging the Port to break with the Czarina, or the Emperor. Count Osterman has even desired me to thank his Lordship ... for all his good offices.¹⁰⁵

Calkoen's efforts to prevent rupture were similarly popular with both the Russians and the Emperor.¹⁰⁶

But a week later everything had changed because of information received from Neplyuev. Rondeau then wrote: 'I ... am sorry to inform your Lordship that this Court [now] thinks very differently ... of my Lord Kinnoull's conduct.' Neplyuev had informed them that he had 'made several insinuations to the Vizir very detrimental to Russia ... [and] ... if His Majesty thought proper to Recall His Lordship it would be only advantageous to the Common cause'. They had heard that 'he was entirely govern'd by ... Luka Kirin' and added that 'in case His Majesty did not ... Recall [him] they earnestly desired the King would not ... mention their complaint – for fear he might in return do this Court & its friends a great deal of hurt.'¹⁰⁷

Neplyuev's account, enclosed, said that:

The English Ambassador Milord Kinnoull following his Interpreter Luka Kirin does not at all converse with [him, Neplyuev] the Dutch Ambassador and the Imperial Resident by concert, having an inclination for the Turks and the French Ambassador. ... He has taken from the Vizier a letter of recommendation about him to the King his Master, & though ... all privately yet [he Neplyuev] and the others came to know ... viz. about three months ago Milord Kinnoull by y^e advice of ... Luka Kirin, perceiving by the dissatisfaction of his Nation that he would be recalled, addressed himself to the Porte, desiring recommendation, all which has been carried on by some of the Turks which being of the French Party and having ... Luka ... for their old friend made their interest with the Vizir for him.

According to Neplyuev Kinnoull had a conference with the Vizier on 26 August in which he blamed the Russians (though he told Neplyuev he justified the Russians) but 'dissuaded the Porte from a Rupture' with Russia and advised them to write to 'his King, who is so powerful that he keeps the Balance of all Europe and consequently [is] able to bring the Court of Russia and that of the Roman Emperor to reason'. The Vizier had praised Kinnoull and noted the Dutch ambassador's partiality for the Russians. Neplyuev said that on 25 September the Vizier had given Kinnoull a letter as requested and had sent it secretly through Valachia and Bohemia, to avoid Vienna, via 'the English youngest interpreter

Jacob Riso who has got from the Vizir 500R [?] for his travelling charges'. Riso was to depart on 17 October.¹⁰⁸

As it happens, we surely have an independent witness in Samuel Medley with regard to the assertions that Kinnoull conversed with the Turks and the French ambassador rather than with Neplyuev, Calkoen and Thalmann. Of course, Medley might have been selective in his reporting and there would have been occasions when Kinnoull was meeting one or other of them without his knowing. Nevertheless, let us look at the previous three months, prior to 17 October, the date of Neplyuev's account: Kinnoull was resident at the embassy in Pera until 25 July, as well as from 26 August to 6 September, and from 3 to 5 October (21 nights); the rest of the time he was based out at Belgrade village, 14 miles out of town (70 nights). The extensive use of Belgrade is explained, at least in part, by Medley's observation on 6 September 1734 that 'His Ex-y m-m &c. Returnd from Pera – the Plague Rageing there'. Medley remained at Belgrade all the time and so could not have known about Kinnoull's movements while the latter was at Pera. However, during the 70 days when he was based at Belgrade, Kinnoull dined 'away' with the French ambassador twice and entertained two French gentlemen (not necessarily from the embassy) once; he dined 'away' with the Dutch ambassador once and received two home visits from him; with the Russians, Neplyuev and Veshnyakov, he dined 'away' four times, received three home visits (two on the same day) and entertained them at home twice, plus Veshnyakov alone once; he dined 'away' four times with Thalmann, entertained him at home twice and members of his embassy staff on two, perhaps three, other occasions.

On that evidence, therefore, it would certainly seem that Neplyuev's account is at best misleading – indeed ungraciously ungrateful for hospitality received! For example, on 16 September 1734, 'his Ex-y wth his Retinue went to Vallade house in the wood [a residence that belonged to the Sultan's mother] – & Entertaind Mr Tallman & y^e 2 moscovits – a very grand feast.' Further, if we look at the year 1734 as a whole, prior to Neplyuev's letter, we find that Medley mentioned Kinnoull having contact, home or away, with the French ambassador nine times, with one or other or both of Neplyuev and Veshnyakov on 22 occasions, with Thalmann 17 times (plus another three visits probably from his embassy staff), with Calkoen ten times, with 'a great turk' once (formal audiences excluded) and with the Dragoman of the Porte twice, once just before this letter of Neplyuev's was written! On Sunday 28 April 1734 'y^e

Druggerman of the port vizited his Ex-y after diner', on Friday 11 October 1734 'the Druggerman of the port came to vizit my L^d In y^e Evening Stayd all night & a Turke from y^e Grandevizir Brought a fine Hawk a present' and on 12 October 1734, 'the Druggerman of the port went Erly this moring – my L^d Dind at 2 Mr Lucka here.'

As regards accusations of important collusion with Villeneuve, it is of interest to note that in Vandal's substantial biography of Villeneuve, Kinnoull is mentioned but once – when he is accused, along with Calkoen, of being friendly with Bonneval and, indeed, of secretly sending him wines and spirits.¹⁰⁹ Perhaps delivery of these was reflected on 23 March 1734 in the mysterious, sole occasion that Medley mentions Bonneval: 'Mr Math went to Genl Bonevall at Staboll afternoon.'

St George's Day, of course, had provided an opportunity for getting them together, but doubtless it was not an occasion for doing much business. On 22 April 1734, 'the German Resident – the French Ambar – the Venetian amb^r y^e Dutch amb^r – all vizited his Ex-y – the German & Dutch Musick here in the Evening St Georges Evening' and on Tuesday 23 April 1734 Medley recalled that on 'St Georges day My L^d Entertained at diner & Suppr many Gentlemen – the two Sweeds Gentⁿ &c. wth Musick – viz french horns &c.' The Russians were in fact not there but Medley tells us, on 21 April 1734, that 'the Moscovite Envoy vizited His Ex-y' the previous evening.

Kinnoull wrote again on 24 January 1735, hoping, as well he might have, that Riso would have arrived by then with his previous letters because:

the Muscovite Resident Nepluef who is a very artful cunning minister is working underground & might occasion false impressions to be given to the Court of Vienna & likewise to His Majesty in order to serve the views of his own Court. ... The dispatches ... could not fail of destroying the Residents intentions to Alarm the Emperor when the King should find that this Court had put their sole confidence in His Majesty. ... In the two conferences with the Vizier in January and April last he expressed himself with great Inveteracy against the Muscovites [to which Kinnoull claims to have given] very general answers. ... Mr Monier and Mr Antonio Pisani was present at these two conferences and found it worth their while immediately to discuss all that passed to Mr Resident Neplueff even while they were in the service.

Kinnoull said that Neplyuev was clearly worried about the extent of England's influence at court, which was why he wanted to have Kinnoull recalled and was using Thalmann and Calkoen as his dupes.

He continued on the matter of Monier: 'In June last, when I discharged Mr Monier ... [Calkoen] took him under his protection.' Kinnoull said he made a formal complaint and was told that Calkoen would soon send him out of the country. But 'he has him constantly with him, treats him with great distinction at his table and he is his great favourite & confidant. He carried him publickly ... to his visit to the new Venetian Ambassador.' 'In Sept. last Mr Nepleoff made peace between us when at Nepleof's desire I invited the Dutch Amb. & the two Residents to dinner in one of the Grand Signior's kiosks or summer houses in the woods near Belgrade Village.' On that occasion Calkoen had complained about Luca being duplicitous in selling out to the French. Then, on Luca's denial and objections from Kinnoull, Neplyuev 'invited us all to dinner at his country house and [Calkoen] gave Mr Luca all the satisfaction he could desire very honestly and publickly' in the presence of the two residents and Mr Vishniakov. Kinnoull, however, said that the apology was insincere and he continued to enthuse about Luca who 'ought to be valued as a precious jewel' and 'God forbid that His Majy should lose him out of his service [Calkoen] will do all he can to discredit the King's Amb for the time being [as he] began with Mr Styanan.'¹¹⁰

Then, on 28 January 1735, we read in Medley's diary: 'Last night (wee hear) Mr Monere was seized in his Return from the venetian Ball – by a Great nor of Turks – the Caus or Event of w^{ch} we do not yet understand.' There was then a furious exchange of letters between Calkoen and Kinnoull (in French) about this matter.

Calkoen claimed that Luca was said to have been present, encouraging the Turks to treat their prisoner '*avec toute sorte de rigueur*'. Indeed, he later claimed that Luca had tried to have Monier killed.¹¹¹ Calkoen also said that Monier was (rightly) under his protection and that he objected to the treatment; Kinnoull responded, but Calkoen then threatened to lay a formal complaint and break diplomatic relations – after using the affair to rub Kinnoull's name in the mud with other ambassadors.¹¹²

Calkoen's letter to his superiors at home, written in February 1735, ran to an amazing 46 pages.¹¹³ In it he justified the protection he had given to Monier and the efforts he had been making to secure his safety, and he

looked for every possible opportunity to blacken Kinnoull's name. One has the feeling that he 'doth protest too much'. He started by saying that Monier, sacked in July 1734, had looked for protection from Calkoen so that he could stay in Constantinople in the hope of a job with Kinnoull's successor, for he expected Kinnoull to be replaced soon. However, he could have had little reason then to expect that, unless perhaps he was indeed privy to a plot to remove him. As we shall see, the decision to recall Kinnoull was not taken until July 1735.

He proposed a theory that the real reason for Kinnoull's treatment of Monier concerned affairs of the heart. He said that a previously good relationship between Kinnoull and Monier had deteriorated when the ambassador asked Monier about certain 'matters of which good manners prohibit mention', which Monier had refused to discuss with him even when Kinnoull became very angry. The situation had quietened down for a while because of the need to keep secret the pregnancy of a young lady in the British ambassadorial court, but the presence of the Swedes in the embassy had aggravated the problem because one of them had apparently sided with Monier. Then, according to Calkoen (presumably via Monier), there had been a bizarre episode, on 8 June 1734 (New Style dating), involving Kinnoull's 'mistress' catching him in bed with her daughter! Apparently, to the edification of members of the household, his 'mistress' had then slapped Kinnoull in the face with his wig, had kicked him down the stairs and, while cursing him, had hit him in the face with her slipper. The daughter, with whom Monier was apparently passionately in love, had left the embassy the same day. They were all out at the summer palace at Belgrade village at the time and Samuel Medley's diary makes no direct reference to all this – he was far too tactful – but the next day's entry¹¹⁴ includes an unusual occurrence that ties in with the story: 'Last Night Mrs Sa-s Came & Lodgd in Mr Clarks Room.'

It is hard to be sure how much truth there is in this story, but the woman whom Calkoen described as 'Kinnoull's mistress' seems likely to have been his housekeeper/companion Judith Sabreau whose daughter was Ann Sandys (Mrs Sa-s), wife of William Sandys who had been private secretary to Kinnoull before Monier, and who was away in England attending to his late father's estate. Mr Clark was Lord Kinnoull's steward and he evidently found space in his family's accommodation to offer Ann Sandys sanctuary! Subsequently, wrote Calkoen, Kinnoull complained to the German and Russian Residents that Monier, while under Calkoen's protection, had continued to court Ann Sandys and to convince her not

to go back to the embassy, despite daily messages from Kinnoull encouraging her to return.

De Saussure, a friend and countryman of Monier's, wrote to Calkoen at this time, saying: 'I am not surprised to learn of the origin of this blow, never doubting that it comes from a household where both he and I had lodged, and where dwell violence, injustice, rage, etc.'¹¹⁵ However, de Saussure, also seemed to indicate some doubts about Calkoen's theory in a later letter:

I should be still more grateful if you would do me the favour of writing to me yet once more to inform me ... if the causes that have provoked it are known, because I cannot believe that it is on account of women's wiles that things have been taken so far.¹¹⁶

To justify having protected Monier, Calkoen needed to convince his superiors that Monier had been sacked for personal reasons and not for betraying state secrets and he went to very great lengths to try to make this case.

He took the opportunity to go over sundry difficulties he had had in his relationship with Kinnoull since the latter's arrival, starting with a story to illustrate Kinnoull's bad temper. Apparently, after a dinner in honour of the King's birthday, on 11 November 1730 (New Style dating), Calkoen had had a cup of tea with Sandys (then Kinnoull's secretary) instead of drinks with the rest of the group. This had made Kinnoull furious and he had 'started to speak to us in words that are not used or listened to by people of standing and character'. Evidently, a slight had been assumed because Kinnoull had then insisted that Calkoen treat his mistress with as much honour and respect as he would treat the wife of the French ambassador; further fury had followed and Kinnoull had thrown Calkoen's hat into the fireplace! Calkoen had had to take flight and hide in the Dutch treasurer's house. Apparently others, including Monier and de Saussure, had heard the shouting and cursing.

Calkoen even enclosed a copy of a letter he had written in 1732 stating that he wished to have 'an appropriate apology and reparation for the damage done, by a party of your people, to my out-of-town Residence'. For some reason, having broken in, they had left a dead falcon there. The letter continued:

I hope that Your Excellency will treat the matter seriously when you consider the country we are living in, and what dangerous consequences could result from it if Christian ministers themselves were to show by example that the sacrosanct diplomatic immunity of ministers' official residences can be violated with impunity.¹¹⁷

Whether or not Kinnoull's reaction, which had included a demand for restitution of the falcon,¹¹⁸ had been justified, Calkoen had continued to hold the matter against him for the three intervening years.

Kinnoull's letter to Newcastle later in February summed up his version of the affair: the minister of the Porte had discovered that meetings with the Grand Vizier in January and April 1734 had been leaked, evidently via Monier and Pisani. Kinnoull accused Pisani of treacherous activities (having first repaid him a loan of £450 with interest, which he owed him) and Pisani then resigned. Two days later Kinnoull sacked Monier, having realized that he had been receiving money to spy for the French (Bonneval) and later for the Muscovites. Monier took refuge with Calkoen and Kinnoull asked for him to be sent out of the country. Kinnoull said that Neplyuev and the Grand Vizier disapproved of Calkoen protecting Monier. A further leak in Dutch newspapers of meetings between Calkoen and Kinnoull with the Grand Vizier had put the Vizier in a rage. Consequently, the Turks seized Monier after the Venetian ball 'where the Dutch Amb had carried him publickly ... cloathed in velvet & brocade'. Calkoen claimed that Kinnoull was the cause of the seizing but Kinnoull said 'I prevailed upon the Government to treat him with Great gentleness. They sent him immediately to the castles at the Dardenelles with orders to ... embark him upon the first ship ... going to any part of Christendom.' Meanwhile, 'The Dutch Amb sent his secretary to carry away all [Monier's] papers.' There had been an exchange of letters between Kinnoull and Calkoen who had then shown the correspondence to the other ambassadors, who were disinclined to meddle; he also showed it to the Porte, where he was not well received. The day after Monier was taken, Bonneval had 'made a prodigious stir' and had evidently been very worried about some papers getting into the wrong hands.¹¹⁹

Kinnoull's letters to Newcastle in March and April revealed that he had arranged for the Porte to remove Monier to the English consul at Smyrna (for a fare of £40) to get him away more quickly.¹²⁰ The English consul at Smyrna tried to put Monier on a French ship but the Dutch consul

bribed the *kadi*, ‘a little cuntry judge’, £220 to delay it, and then stirred up trouble at the Porte. Kinnoull discussed the matter with the Vizier who told Calkoen that he would order a further delay, but he in fact made sure that Monier was put on the next ship, a French one going to Leghorn, to get rid of him. Calkoen then asked the French ambassador to have him put in the hands of the Dutch consul at Leghorn, but the French ambassador refused to meddle. Kinnoull thought that Monier would be well advised to stay in Leghorn and that he was lucky not to be carried on to Toulon where the ship was going because he may have been suspected of involvement with a French spy called Bonne who was in the Bastille.¹²¹

In due course, in May, Monier wrote to Newcastle as follows:

J'ay en l'honneur de server SE My Lord Kinnoull en qualité de Sectretaire titulaire et en 1731 je fus envoyé ... a la Cour d'Angleterre [to present a letter from the Sultan]. Votre grandeur me fit honneur de me charger de la Reponse ... je rejoignis My Lord Kinnoull en 1732 (et) ... continuai ... jusqu'au mois de Juillet 1734 auquel tems My Lord me congeda sans me temoigner aucune animosité, m'ayant au contraire offert gracieusement un lettre de Recommandation per votre grandeur.

Kinnoull had promised Monier that he would let it be known that he had left under no cloud; he had eaten with him, along with Stadnicky, his chargé d'affaire and many others. Believing that he was free to do so, Monier had asked Calkoen to grant him protection as a Berne citizen, after which ‘*j'ai vecu tranquillement et publiquement à Constantinople*’ until 7 February 1735. At that point ‘*je fus enlevé de nuit et d'une manière tres violante par 17 Turcs, et cela à l'Instance faite auprès de Vizir par le Sieur Lucaky premier Drogueman de SE My Lord Kinnoull au Nom et par les Ordrs duquel il agissoit*’ and if it had not been for Calkoen’s action he would probably have lost his life. He was imprisoned in the castles, and then taken to Smyrna from where, after 46 days, he was put on a French ship with 200 piastres to arrive in Livorno on 26 April. Lord Kinnoull had written to Calkoen that Monier was a traitor against England. He pleaded innocence and asked Newcastle to hear his case.¹²²

Meanwhile, the Russians turned up the heat and an abstract of a report dated 23 February 1735 from the ‘Russian Minister to Constantinople’, namely Rear Admiral Neplyuev, ‘and y^e Counsellor of the Court Veshniakoff’ said that:

The conduct which ... Lord Kinnoull especially his dragoman Luckaky keeps is ... prejudicial to her Imp. Maj ... Likewise ... to ... Germany ... [They] have shown plainly the private understanding ... with y^e French ... and the Porte ... endeavouring to bring the Porte to a Rupture with Russia and ... Germany. ... Luckaky rails at the Dutch Amb publicly telling the Porte false stories of him as if he encourages Russia and ... Germany against the Porte in their present distress with Persia. ... Luckaky ... has kindled such a great fire between the Dutch Amb and Lord Kinnoull that the latter has been induced ... to give a memorial to the Porte against one Monier a Suiper born that had been in L^d K's service before as Secretary and ... was dismissed from him ... in 1733 and which after he had been under the protection of the Dutch Amb was taken up at night in the street by some Turks posted on purpose thrown chained into a boat and carried off ... upon which ... Luckaky began to rail ... against that Monier divulging that he had betrayd the Amb to the Russia Ministers for 200 Ducats in giving them ... secrets ... carried on with the Porte. ... Luckaky ... dares to spit at both Imperial persons ... and ... has injured the Russian Resident Nepluef and the Imperial Resident Thalmann with the foulest of words.¹²³

After Monier's removal, Calkoen had been quick to seize all Monier's papers and Kinnoull evidently felt that he had a bit of explaining (or rationalizing) to do. He explained to Newcastle that he had decided not to seize the papers even though Monier had indulged in 'treachery and dangerous conduct ... for above a year before he was discharged in June ... and for 7 months afterwards'. He said that his main reason for not seizing the papers was that, if he had, others compromised would have known that Kinnoull knew all the secrets of their meetings and 'would have been very much ashamed and exasperated against me', whereas Kinnoull had been present at most of the meetings anyway. He also said that, similarly, those at the factory would have been alarmed about the correspondence with them. However, his most important reason was that when both sides 'could no longer have doubted of my knowing the whole secret ... of his double correspondence with the Turks and Bonneval & with their Enemies at the same time might ... have created jealousies and distrust of me in both & consequently' this would have prevented him from keeping 'things quiet ... betwixt the Court and the

THINGS FALL APART

Muscovites', whereas these secrets in the hands of the Dutch ambassador would only have embarrassed him.

Also, Kinnoull claimed to have prevailed 'with the Minister of the Porte not to meddle with the Monier papers', thus preventing that touchpaper being lit. He was confident that the papers contained nothing of importance not already leaked or known to Kinnoull.

He had further explaining to do over having retained Pisani through the January and April meetings with the Grand Vizier, despite previous suspicions, for this had led to revelations that had upset the Vizier.

The Dutch ambassador had asked the whole factory to dinner and had talked for an hour against Kinnoull. Everybody told Kinnoull that they supported him, except Lisle and Barker.¹²⁴

FURTHER PRESSURE

From Medley we learn (on 12 March 1735) that 'Mr Viznicoff – made a public vizeit in form to his Ex-y – on account of his being made Resident – for y^c Moscovites' and (on 18 March 1735) 'a Rany Morning – His Ex-y wth all of us the Retinue – went in Grand Ceremony – to Mr Vizicoff y^c Moscovite Resident'. However, the two Russians continued to work in tandem and an abstract from a further letter home from Neptyuev and Veshnyakov at the start of April kept up the pressure, saying that 'the English Ambassador and the Dragoman Luka Kirin' continue to show animosity towards Russia and Germany and 'do not keep almost any conversation at all with them', Neptyuev and Veshnyakov. 'The French Amb ... with the English endeavour to insinuate among the Turks ... to ... encourage them to continue in their preparations of war.' The English ambassador had not been with them for more than 40 days (and the dragoman Luka never) but he spent his time with the French ambassador and 'the Polish Gentⁿ Stadnitzki'.¹²⁵

Medley, however, noted, in March, contact with the French ambassador twice, with the Russians four times, with Thalmann once and with Stadnicki three times. Over the first three months of the year, he noted nine contacts with the French ambassador, ten with the Russians, seven with Thalmann and thirteen with Stadnicki, whose company we know Kinnoull enjoyed.

Although matters had moved on somewhat by then anyway, the Russians would certainly have disapproved of one Tuesday evening (3 June 1735) on which Medley reported: 'His Ex-y Entertained at a very Sumptuous diner – the french amb^r the venetian amb^r – the Count

Kininsky – the 2 Sweeds Gentⁿ & madam amb's of france & many other Genn.'

Rondeau, in St Petersburg, wrote to Harrington to say that the reports from Neplyuev and Vesnyakov were believed:

I am very sorry that I am obliged to inform your Lordship that Count Osterman has told me that they ... received ... from Constantinople ... heavy complaints against my Lord Kinnoull who they assure is entirely in the interests of the French & the Port & that he does this Court all the Ill offices he can, being governed by His Interpreter Luka Kirin who is their great enemy, tho he had often received money from this Court. ... The Czarina ... is desirous that His Maj would ... recall My Lord Kinnoull ... [or at least] order [him] to discharge his Interpreter Luka Kirin.¹²⁶

Kinnoull, however, evidently had a sympathetic ear in Robinson in Vienna and he wrote to him in April expressing profuse thanks for his support over his fallout with Calkoen, 'likewise for the particular attention which you rightly judged necessary to prevent your Courts meddling in this affair'. Kinnoull also thanked him enthusiastically for presenting Kinnoull's side in the Monier affair so effectively to the Imperial Court. Kinnoull remained very surprised that the German court was still so worried about Kinnoull's relations with the French ambassador. 'I never found that my keeping up the same friendly intercourse with the French amb which I did with all the other Christian ministers here had ever had the least bad Consequences with regard to his Impl Majesty's interests at this Court; on the contrary.'¹²⁷

Newcastle wrote to Kinnoull in mid-May thanking him for seven letters dated between 30 November 1734 and 22 March 1735; this was his first letter to Kinnoull since 19 November 1734. The letter to the King, and with it Kinnoull's letters to Newcastle, arrived, according to Riso, on 17 January 1735. Inevitably, he said that the King was sick and tired of hearing complaints about Kinnoull favouring the French against Russia. Newcastle's orders were the reverse of this and he ordered Kinnoull to dismiss Luca Chirico. He said that Kinnoull had done wrong in acting precipitately in the Monier affair and ordered him to 'live in perfect harmony and correspondence with the Dutch amb'. Newcastle then gave him and Luca each a final chance to reform their behaviour. Kinnoull was to tell the ambassadors of Austria, Holland and Germany

that if they had any further complaints against Luca that he would have to go.¹²⁸

In July, Kinnoull replied to Newcastle to the effect that, since receiving orders to mend fences with Russia and Germany, to be less friendly to France and to dismiss Luca, he had dined with Neplyuev (now retired for health reasons) as well as with Veshnyakov and Thalmann, who had showed surprise and indicated support for him but had given 'no answer' as regards accusations against Luca. Kinnoull subsequently talked to Thalmann privately and found him even more supportive. He later visited Neplyuev who 'could not deny that he had complained ... of continuing correspondence with young Count Stadnicki who, though left here as Resident from the Republick, yet [had] accepted a commission from K Stanislaus'. Neplyuev thought that, like Calkoen, Kinnoull should have had no correspondence with him. While Kinnoull claimed that he never received Stadnicki as a public minister, only as a Polish nobleman living in Constantinople, Neplyuev said that friendship with the French ambassador and friends of France like Stadnicki gave the wrong impression. Kinnoull was inclined to believe the support that Neplyuev and Thalmann professed, but suspected Veshnyakov of being 'a meer tool of the Dutch Amb', and Calkoen of being the source of the reports against him.¹²⁹

With respect to Calkoen, Kinnoull wrote in August of the former's continued refusal to renew relations with him, contrary to orders from the States General. Calkoen 'declares very openly that if I continue here that he will give up his Embassy'.¹³⁰

A diversion at the end of July in relation to Stadnicki caused Kinnoull, Thalmann and the Russians to cooperate with each other: on 24 July Stadnicki 'received Credential letters to the Porte' from King Augustus and the republic of Poland 'confirming him as Resident ... for the said Republic'. The Turks and even more the French were very surprised about this. He presented his credentials on 27 July and on the 29th the Grand Signor decided to send him away to Adrianople on the grounds that they wished to remain neutral until it had become clear who was established on the throne of Poland. To be more precise, 'two Chiaux's took him under the arms – in his waistcoat without his cap or Sword, and put him in a covered wagon, and carried him through the quatrastrada ... in this manner ... to ponte piccolo about three hours ... in the way to Adrianople'.¹³¹ Attempts by Neplyuev, Thalmann and Kinnoull to intercede were unsuccessful and he was still stuck in Adrianople in mid-

November. Rondeau included Calkoen among those who had tried to intercede with the Porte (but other sources fail to confirm this) and said that their failure to be heard ‘proves the great credit the French court has in Constantinople’.¹³²

On 10 July Harrington wrote to Rondeau telling him that Kinnoull ‘had been told to exert himself with all his skill & credit at Constantinople to preserve the peace ... between the Turks and ... Muscovites’, but that Neplyuev and Veshnyakov had no confidence in Kinnoull doing that.¹³³ On 17 July, Harrington wrote to Kinnoull to say that the King was upset to hear that the Porte had resolved to march an army of Tartars through Russian territory to help in the war against the Persians; the King had heard that Kinnoull had, in audience with the Grand Vizier ‘declared to him that [he] saw no reason why the porte should be so scrupulous with regard to Russia in order to attack [the Persians], since the Muscovites had so often broken their treaties with the Turks’. Kinnoull must watch what Luca is saying: ‘The King is receiving every day fresh complaints of his constant opposition to the interests of the Emperor & the Czarina.’¹³⁴

On 20 July he wrote again saying that:

The King observed with concern that the complaints against the Earl of Kinnoull rather increase than abate [and although Kinnoull had been ordered to dismiss Luca Chirico] the King finds that the jealousys are grown so great against his conduct that ... he has resolved to recall the earl of Kinnoull.¹³⁵

In a letter to Horace Walpole in July, Harrington, commenting on the King’s wish for Kinnoull’s removal, said that ‘his conduct [is] certainly too suspicious to be borne any longer.’¹³⁶ The suspicion was, presumably, once again, that Jacobite sympathies had led Kinnoull to favour the French. It was a particularly bad moment in that the King and Walpole were still feeling jittery over the Cornbury plot, for a French invasion intended to result in putting the Old Pretender on the throne, which got as far as consideration by Louis XV’s inner cabinet before being squashed by a sceptical Cardinal Fleury.¹³⁷

By 14 August Harrington was in a position to tell Robinson that Sir Everard Fawkener would be Kinnoull’s replacement.¹³⁸ However, the letter of recall was not written until 22 September. It read as follows:

Right Trusty and Welbeloved Cousin we greet you well. Whereas we have thought fit to recall you from your Embassy in Turkey and to appoint Our Trusty and Welbeloved Sir Everard Fawkener Kt to succeed you in that Employment, we do accordingly hereby signify our Pleasure to you that upon the said Sir Everard Fawkener's arrival there you take your leave of the Grand Signior and Vizier in the usual manner with all convenient Expedition and so we bid you heartily farewell. Given at our Court at Hanover the 22 Day of September 1735.¹³⁹

Kinnoull must, however, have had some prior warning, because on 27 September, in other words before the letter could have arrived, he wrote to Robinson, saying: 'I expect my successor with impatience to be delivered from this place before the depth of winter.'¹⁴⁰

In the meantime, however, he had to hold the fort, despite doubtless suffering from some stress, one possible effect of which we will unkindly quote from Medley's entry for 30 August 1735: 'His Ex-y Indispo^{s'd} – haveing the Hemroyds – a Rany day.' He continued 'indispos'd' for the next six days but found the energy to write to Rondeau during that period saying: 'You may assure your Court that I shall continue to do all that is in my power to keep things quiet here and shall assist Mr resident Visnikoff at the Court upon all occasions for her Czarish majesty's Interest.'¹⁴¹ To Harrington, ten days later, he included a note about reconciliation with Calkoen:

we dined together at Mr Veskniaoff's on 6th instant when he gave a great entertainment to all the Ministers upon Mr Nepluef's going away. ... I invited [Calkoen] and all the Company to dine with me the next day. He ... was very good company and gave me a great many assurances of his friendship etc.

There was a further entertainment on the 8th, during which Nepluev apparently told Kinnoull that all the suspicions of Vienna and St Petersburg had rested on Riso's expedition.¹⁴² Nepluev then left for home. Samuel Medley noticed all this leave taking and reconciliatory entertainment in his own style. On Friday 5 September 1735 'My L^d vizited M^r nepleof the Late moscovite Envoy – & dind on Return;' on Saturday 6 September 'His Ex-y dind at the moscovite Pallace;' on the 7th 'the venetian & the dutch amb^s – the German & moscovite Residents

– the Druggman [dragoman] of y^e port &c. dind wth His Ex-y a very fine Entertainment’; on Monday 8 September:

His Ex-y wth many other ministers went to Sattabat – to dine wth Mr nepleoff the Moscovite Envoy – (that wass) on his way homeward to petersburg – I walked to Mr Lyles Mr Hangers & Mr Barkers Morning & wth Mr Clarke Evening to y^e Buring ground

Kinnoull wrote to Newcastle on 27 September saying that Veshnyakov, Thalmann and Calkoen were insisting on his doing what the King had ordered (of which they now had copies from their own courts) and so, before the new Vizier took over, he dismissed Luca forthwith. Kinnoull said that he would have done so a lot earlier had there been a proper complaint against Luca; now, since they were still suspicious of Luca, he would cooperate with them. He was appointing Antonio Gerachi as first dragoman (he claimed that he had been unjustly removed 14 years previously) and Pisani (who was supposedly repentant of his sins) as second dragoman.¹⁴³ Medley reported the changes succinctly on 15 September 1735: ‘M^r Pizany was Restoord to his Ex-ys favour and made Second druggerman againe M^r Lucka dischargd – ... M^r pezany & others dind wth my L^d the drugg-n of y^e port here.’ Kinnoull told Robinson, in late October, that ‘Mr Luca talks of going to England to justify himself. The rest of the dragomen his rivals and enemies watch his motions with great ease.’¹⁴⁴

Kinnoull interceded with Newcastle on behalf of Luca (and his family) whom he believed was entirely innocent and he hoped to secure a pension for him from the King and from the Levant Company.¹⁴⁵ Having heard from Luca directly and considered his petition, the Levant Company in London said that they thought the annual gratuity of \$400, granted to him in 1719, over and above his salary, would be sufficient.¹⁴⁶ However, the following January they tried to persuade Newcastle to review the order to sack Luca, whom they wanted to keep.¹⁴⁷

Kinnoull maintained his support for Luca,¹⁴⁸ but Sir Everard Fawkener, Kinnoull’s successor, understandably had to assure the Dutch, Russian and German ministers that he would not employ Luca Chirico or ‘communicate with him any affair publick or particular’, but he told Newcastle that he would give him protection ‘from entire ruin’.¹⁴⁹

THINGS FALL APART

THE NEW AMBASSADOR'S ARRIVAL AND THE EVENTUAL DEPARTURE OF THE OLD

The new ambassador, Sir Everard Fawkener, appeared on the horizon early in November. According to Medley's entry for Monday 3 November 1735, 'they went to day to meet the new amb^r towards the fronteer of Germany.' Fawkener said he had been flattered by the appointment; he had been told to hurry. He said he would be bringing two gentlemen and as many servants who were suitable as he could find.¹⁵⁰ On Saturday 8 November 1735, Kinnoull moved out to the old Russian embassy, or, as Medley put it, 'His Ex-y Removed to y^e moscovite palace.' This palace was in the 'quartastrada' and Medley then found himself going to and fro rather often between His Excellency's old and new residencies – and the process of moving went on well into December:

3 December 1735

His Ex-y here afternoon Sending things away.

6 December 1735

I walked 4 times to y^e other palace & dind there a 6.

11 December 1735

m-m here all afternoon sending things away.

19 December 1735

Sr Everard falkoner the new ambasador arived here In the Evening – Whome my Lord Kinoul Entertaind – wth all the Merchants and a very grand Supper it wass much snow all night.

Saturday 20 December 1735

a great Snow fell Last night – & a very Keen frost Is Come this morning my L^d entertain His Ex-y Sr E fallconer the new ambasr at diner & Super.

21 December 1735

Mr Pain Read the Service My L^d Kinoul at Church – who Entertaind (again) Sr Ev-d – at diner – the new amb^r & also at Supper & all the nation [i.e. the merchants].

Fawkener not only brought with him the usual instructions requesting Kinnoull to prime him on embassy matters but also a letter from the Levant Company in London asking him to brief Fawkener about Levant Company business.¹⁵¹ All the indications were, however, that Fawkener would have been a good deal better informed about this than Kinnoull (except possibly as regards any immediate matters) since he and his family had been involved in trading in the Levant for years. He himself had been admitted as a freeman of the Levant Company on 25 June 1725.¹⁵² There was also a letter from London to Jennings, the current treasurer at Constantinople, asking him to pay Kinnoull 1200 dollars (£175) for the return of himself and his servants to England.¹⁵³

However, Kinnoull was in no hurry to leave. He wrote to Sir Robert Walpole towards the end of January 1736 saying that he was very surprised to find himself recalled; he felt he was innocent and unjustly accused. Between £1200 and £1300 was owing to him that had nothing to do with the Levant Company; he had made no profit from his time in Constantinople and had 'had to take up money with interest from time to time'. He wanted credit with the Levant Company to be remitted to Constantinople. He expected to take leave of the Grand Vizier in April.¹⁵⁴

A month earlier, he had written an unrepentant letter to Horace Walpole, thanking him for a letter of advice¹⁵⁵ and saying:

I flatter myself that my conduct at this Court ... will deserve the Character w^{ch} my great Friend and Patron the late Duke of Devonshire had the goodness to give of me to the King. Your brother Sir Robert Walpole for many years favour'd me with his particular affection and esteem & I owe my being employ'd to the good opinion he was pleas'd to have of me from his own observation as well as from the kind recommendation of that great Person, who as he was a father to me, was likewise a true friend & support, as far as in him lay – to your brother's administration, to his dying day. ... I am too sensible of the Envy and Malice of this place not to know that I have hitherto been protected by Sir Robert's kindness for me from the consequences of the many lyes which have from time to time been sent to England, in order to get me removed.¹⁵⁶

He told Newcastle, that he wanted £1200: he said that he was owed that

and more from His Majesty for ‘my bills of extraordinary expenses for HM’s particular service during the 6 years of my Embassy’. He mentioned the ‘cruel injury that foreigners have done to me’. He hoped for the governorship of Barbados because he wished ‘to serve my family even at the expense of my health & quiet’. He was ready to give up to Dupplin and his sisters and brothers ‘whatever part your Grace shall determine of the salary which is payable in London’ for the post. Leaving no string unpulled, he added: ‘Your Grace will hereby do such a real service to one of the oldest familys of the Island.’¹⁵⁷

There was a special family connection with Barbados, which, along with other Caribbean islands, James Hay, Earl of Carlisle, had possessed and invested in during the reign of King Charles I. On the death of his father in 1719, Kinnoull had applied to the treasury for £4750 arrears of annuity, which he claimed his father should have received in connection with the surrender of these islands to the Crown. In fact, Kinnoull thereafter received the hereditary pension of £1000 per annum from this source.¹⁵⁸

Fawkener of course took over responsibility for formal entertaining, along with other diplomatic matters, and on 1 March 1736 Medley noted: ‘Monday the Queen of Englands Birthday S^r Evrad giv a fine Entertainment for y^e English nation my L^d Kinoull there.’

Evidently, formalities in relation to the Grand Vizier and the Grand Signor were in fact achieved in April:

Saturday 3 April 1736

we went wth Sr Evrad to the audience of the vizir.

Tuesday 20 April 1736

I waked all Last night – to goe Erly this morning wth S^r Evrad falconer to the grand Senir I was out by 2 a Clock in the morning wth the nation & whole Retinue.

Tuesday 27 April 1736

my L^d Kinoull and all of us his Retinue went to Stamboll to take Leave of the vizir Capⁿ Osborn & many other Gentⁿ went allsoe.

Fawkener hoped to get rid of Kinnoull on the *Portland*, a man-of-war appointed to take him home. However, Kinnoull was waiting to hear from Walpole and refusing to fix a date for his departure.¹⁵⁹ He told

Newcastle that he could not leave until he was in a position to pay his debts.¹⁶⁰ In the end, Captain Osborne of the *Portland* wrote to Kinnoull to say that he was sorry to insist on a departure date but that his stores were running down and that he could not keep on waiting. Also, he was apprehensive about Kinnoull wanting to bring 'so many' of his horses on board.¹⁶¹ On 7 May, Osborne told him that he could stay for another ten days, but no longer because his provisions were already decaying.¹⁶²

Fawkener reported to Newcastle on 1 June that Kinnoull had not left in the man-of-war. He had been talking to Bonneval and was 'engaged in designs and negotiations. ... In the freedom of wine he is very apt to forget himself & even in the presence of the Muscovite Resident very lately, all the old rancour broke out.' He was trying to discredit Fawkener and his dragoman (Gerachi and/or Pisani): 'no good can come from his Lordship's meddling or at all interfering, the Porte have no regard for him, the other Courts are diffident of him.'

Fawkener said that Kinnoull was very short of money and 'is distrest to find small sums, & a long journey can't be undertaken without ready Money'. In fact, Fawkener said that he too did not get enough money and hoped for £1800. He mentioned the need for money for 'little gifts and presents'.¹⁶³ Ten days later Fawkener told Harrington that Kinnoull was still at Pera and that there was a general belief that he was not only waiting for money but also wanted to take part in any negotiations for peace that might be imminent (and potentially financially rewarding for the mediator). Fawkener described him as 'the most incompatible character I ever yet saw' and said that 'he has quarrels & revenge to take, & which he threatens, of almost everybody he has ever had anything to do with here'.¹⁶⁴ According to Rondeau, Calkoen was still doing his bit to try to ensure Kinnoull's early removal and had written to Swarts (the Dutch Resident at St Petersburg) in November 1736 to say that Kinnoull was still in Constantinople and that 'Hopken & Carlson the Swedish Ministers at the Porte were entirely devoted to His Lordship & to the French Ambassador'.¹⁶⁵

In mid-July Newcastle wrote to Kinnoull saying that it was 'highly improper' of him to stay after His Majesty's recall and that it was 'His Majesty's' express command that he should desist from any matters relating to his previous employ or to Muscovite/Turkish disputes. Also, it was His Majesty's pleasure that he should return home and that he should not refuse the King's command. He added a further note marked

‘private’, ‘out of friendship to you and your family’ insisting that Kinnoull must come home and not indulge in any dealings at the Porte on foreign affairs. As regards the money, Walpole had told Dupplin, and Newcastle had added his own assurance, that nothing could be done because there was no precedent for it.¹⁶⁶

At the end of August, Fawkenner reported that Kinnoull had agreed to leave as soon as possible and was disposing of his goods. He had asked Fawkenner for money and Fawkenner was waiting to see how much his debts were. He would give him a credit in France for the journey. There was an implication that some leeway would be allowed in helping Kinnoull *in extremis*.¹⁶⁷

Kinnoull told Newcastle that since no money was forthcoming he would sell everything except his books, which he would leave with Fawkenner as security for the money he was going to lend him. He was very vexed at the prospect of leaving ‘4 of the finest horses’ that he had intended to bring back for the King. He was also vexed about the ‘black storys & inventions’ against him. He thanked Newcastle for his private letter and said that he could clear up all false rumours very quickly, but remained very upset that the slanders should have been believed.¹⁶⁸ By mid-September Kinnoull was talking of travelling ‘with his family’ via France.¹⁶⁹

Kinnoull’s debts were now up to £1800, but Horace Walpole told him that officials in the Secretary of State’s department had said that ‘the charges of the Embassy to the Porte have always been maintained by the Levant Co.’ and that ‘no sort of allowance, as they recollect, has ever been made to HM’s Ambassador at the Porte for extraordinary disbursements for the King’s service.’ His Majesty had told Fawkenner to pay £200–£300 for home travel expenses and that Kinnoull should now return.¹⁷⁰

Walpole told Rondeau that ‘Kinnoull ... made some excuses for his stay at Constantinople which the King thought insufficient and frivolous and I therefore repeated His Majesty’s orders to him to leave that place without further delay.’¹⁷¹ But, on 9 October, Kinnoull told Newcastle that there was a shortage of shipping and that he intended to use a French ship sailing direct to Marseilles.¹⁷² By 23 November Fawkenner had heard that he would be leaving on a French ship in January;¹⁷³ by 24 January 1737 he was, however, applying to leave on a French ship a month later and Fawkenner said that he would give him a letter of credit in Marseilles.¹⁷⁴ Fawkenner paid the captain of the French ship, due to leave on 24 February, £300 to take Kinnoull¹⁷⁵ and he actually seems to

have left on 2 May, managing to take with him the horses for the King!¹⁷⁶

Samuel Medley's diary runs out of steam increasingly once he realizes that his master's embassy is coming to an end, and ceases altogether on 9 November 1736. At no stage does he actually mention that he is expecting to go home to England and at no stage does he comment in any way on the fate of Lord Kinnoull. Indeed, if one did not know that the arrival of the new ambassador meant that Kinnoull was super-numerary, one would not learn this from Medley, who notes, for instance, at the end of October 1736:

30 October 1736

K Georges Birthday. my L^d came from Belgrade & dind at Sr Everards & Supt wth y^e Sweeds I waited on him.

Sunday 31 October 1736

my L^d dind at the German ambassadours wth all y^e Ministers of all courts.

Monday 1 November 1736

my L^d dind at y^e French.

2 November 1736

my L^d dind Sweeds palace.

Kinnoull next wrote to Newcastle privately in mid-June, from an infirmary near Marseilles, to say that the French ship had been delayed for four months because a cargo of wool had been found not to have been properly dried and that it was a fire risk. The cargo had to be unloaded and dried. It had now done half its quarantine and had 15 days to go. Fawkener had promised him £1000 to pay his debts, but when it came down to it he refused to make the loan because of the expenses his own embassy had incurred to the Turks in attempting to mediate with the Muscovites. Kinnoull had therefore appealed to the Swedish ministers at the Porte who had lent him £1625 to pay off his debts. Kinnoull thought that His Majesty would reimburse him. Now he had no money to get home, and quarantine 'for myself, the horses & servants' would cost him £100. Then he had to get through France. He wanted £500 credit at Marseilles from Newcastle and felt sure that His

Majesty would fund everything when he heard Kinnoull personally.¹⁷⁷ However, Kinnoull was refused yet again: Newcastle told him that His Majesty 'has gone as far as is proper' and that it would be 'highly improper' for him to do what Kinnoull asked.¹⁷⁸ Nonetheless, he apparently managed to borrow £600 in Marseilles from some other source to get him on his way.¹⁷⁹

Evidently, he left the Swedes his precious books and also plate and furniture as security for their loan to him and was charged 12 per cent interest; when he failed to repay them after a year, they sold all these 'for a trifling sum, not the tenth part of the value (particularly the Books, there being no body in that country to buy Books of Learning)'. He then still owed them about £1300.¹⁸⁰

At the end of September, Kinnoull tried pleading yet again, this time from Fontainebleau, for £200 to get him home,¹⁸¹ but was still unsuccessful!¹⁸² We are left to guess how he got himself and 'family', including Samuel Medley, home in the end. With regard to the horses for the King, a letter written to Walpole from Pall Mall on Christmas Eve 1737 gave an account of how the King received 'the three finest stallions that have been brought to England these 50 years'.¹⁸³ It seemed as if the King chose from the original four, admitting that they were 'three as fine horses as ever I saw', so presumably Kinnoull managed to keep one for himself. Kinnoull then asked Walpole for £100 on account 'of what the King is to give me for these Horses'. He said that he was broke and that his landlord was chasing him; he concluded: 'I have learnt to be a great economist at my cost.' Whatever he was eventually paid for the horses, there is a delightful series of entries in Kinnoull's account at Drummond's Bank between August and December that year including:

1 August	Charges for Barbary horse on board of ship	£3	13s	6d
	Paid ship Stuart [steward] for care of ditto	£2	2s	0d
6 December	Ditto paid for horse keeping	£11	14s	8d

Along with some charges for 'Letters', he would appear to have put in an expenses claim for £17.14s.5d, which was paid the next month.¹⁸⁴

At the beginning of August 1738 he wrote to Newcastle yet again: 'If you can procure me the Government of Barbados, your Grace will deliver me at once from the uneasiness of my Family, from that of my

creditors, and from the malice that was carried on against me while I was in Turkey.’ His aim was to keep the estate together and he said that ‘If my family have contributed to the running of me down, they are very much in the wrong.’ There was much self-justification; the Imperial and Russian courts had misrepresented him and treated him badly. If the King did not do something for him soon people would think that his recall had been justified. However, he promised not to write again in the same vein!¹⁸⁵

Kinnoull had returned home in disgrace, as far as his family, his friends and his political masters were concerned. For all of these, the ultimate sin was his loss of reputation and his financial failure – whatever the causes. Jonathan Swift was in no doubt about Kinnoull’s character, and wrote to Edward Harley, now Earl of Oxford, thus:

I had always the greatest esteem for my Lady Kinnoull, and yet mingled with the greatest commiseration, because I never was so deceived in any man as in her lord, who I exceedingly loved in the Queen’s time. But ... my opinion of him for several years past hath been wholly changed. I hope my Lord Dupplin will have it in his power and resolution to comfort his mother.¹⁸⁶

In his absence, his wife and family had managed, financially, though not easily. It is clear from the correspondence that the Countess was in charge of running the Brodsworth estate; the trustees controlled affairs on the Scottish estates, which was something she acknowledged with gratitude to Sir Patrick Murray: ‘I am very sensible that it is entirely owing to you that the Estate was put into Trustees hands & if it had not been done the Estate would have been ruined past recovery.’¹⁸⁷ She had her difficulties with affairs at Brodsworth, relying on ‘my steward Jos Dickinson’ to help her. Various letters dated 1732 and 1734 indicate that she had to deal with payments of interest on various outstanding debts and mortgages, with some help from her eldest son, Lord Dupplin.¹⁸⁸

Unfortunately, Kinnoull had been unable to recover his family fortunes in Turkey. His conduct of his personal finances did not improve once he reached Constantinople. We have seen examples of the arguments he had with the Levant Company over expenses for entertaining and other matters.¹⁸⁹ He borrowed money from his secretary Monier, from the Swiss visitor de Saussure and from the dragoman Pisani (£450); he also admitted to Walpole that he had taken

up money at interest from other sources.¹⁹⁰ The real problem came when he lost his job and had to find the money to get home again, after refusing to board the ship that had been sent for this purpose. He accumulated further debts by this delay.

Also, he never followed his good intentions of retiring to the country and living frugally; he remained convinced that if he stayed in London the King would offer him another post that would be profitable. Although his request to be sent to Barbados as governor was ignored, he remained optimistic.

Fortunately for the family, Thomas Harley, a relation, died in 1738 and, according to Edward Harley, left '£3000 to my sister K's children in trust that it may not be come at by L^d. K.'¹⁹¹

Kinnoull continued to entrust the management of his estates in Scotland to his trustees and to Robert Craigie, one of the trustees and an advocate in Edinburgh¹⁹² who seemed to have taken up the mantle of Sir Patrick Murray who had died in 1735. The ongoing state of Kinnoull's financial affairs was clarified in a letter written jointly by Kinnoull and Dupplin to the chairman of the trustees¹⁹³ in 1742. In this letter they provided the trustees with a summary of the debts Kinnoull had run up during his embassy in Constantinople and requested that £2500 be charged to the Scottish estates 'if by the nature of the Deed of Entail & of the Deed of Trust' this could be done,¹⁹⁴ so that he could pay them off. There are further letters in the 1750s. In 1752, from his house in Whitehall, Kinnoull wrote to Craigie, as follows:

I have now lived here fifteen years since I came from abroad in a very private manner, expecting that something might cast up to my advantage, so that I might not increase the Debt of the Family. ... But these expectations grow weaker every day, and it is time for me to think of Ease & Quiet – Debts contracted before I went abroad, & during my residence in Turkey, have constantly drained me of Money. ... Lord Dupplin is so sensible of this my Situation ... that ... He presses me to Desire The Trustees that a Sum of Money may be raised upon the Scots Estates, Part of which will be apply'd to the Discharging of my Debts, & the other part He will take to himself. ... Five Thousand pounds will make us both Easie.¹⁹⁵

The trustees agreed to this and Dupplin wrote a letter of thanks to Craigie: 'As for the Debt on the Estate Lord K does not despair of living

to see it paid off – but it must be by a carefull conduct of leaving off all political Castles in the Air – at his time of Life he has no business with Courts & parliaments.’¹⁹⁶ Fortunately for Kinnoull, further efforts on his behalf by his son Thomas eventually secured him a secret service pension of £800 per annum, but not until 1754 when he had only four more years to live. These ‘secret service pensions’ were approved by Newcastle for payment to needy members of the House of Lords who had done service to the state and he managed to include himself among the recipients!¹⁹⁷

However, Kinnoull seems still to have been unable to make ends meet and by 1756 he was asking the trustees again for a sum that would add ‘only £1000 to £22,000 Debt’. He said that Dupplin was in agreement with the request and he stressed that ‘I must now Starve in Order to pay my Creditors. ... I must & will live upon bread & Water till my Creditors here are paid ... this is absolutely the last Sum I shall ask.’¹⁹⁸

Lady Abigail had died at Brodsworth in 1750, having continued to live there most of the time. The Earl followed her in 1758, spending his final years at Ashford in Middlesex in the company of Mrs Judith Sabreau, the widow who was the mother of Ann Sandys.¹⁹⁹ From circumstantial evidence, it is almost certain that she was the Madam in Medley’s diary – Kinnoull’s housekeeper, companion and perhaps mistress in Constantinople. Kinnoull seemed to have moved to Ashford at least three years before. (He wrote to Newcastle from there on 13 April 1755.)

Kinnoull’s eldest son Thomas was ‘among the most distinguished and able men of the day’,²⁰⁰ holding such posts as joint paymaster and chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. His second son, Robert Hay-Drummond, took holy orders and became Archbishop of York. Only two of his six daughters married.

Fortunately, the Duke of Newcastle managed to get the daughters a small annual pension from the Crown of £100 a year, so they were not totally dependent on the uncertain finances of their father. We find Kinnoull writing to Newcastle in August 1750, thanking him for obtaining the favour of the King’s ‘most gracious goodness to my daughters’ and for his continued ‘goodness to me and mine’.²⁰¹ Kinnoull’s daughter Margaret wrote to Newcastle saying: ‘My sisters and I being Informed that The King has been graciously pleased to Grant unto us A Pension of £100 a year for each [we offer] Humble Thanks for your kindness to us in obtaining this Great Favour.’²⁰²

THINGS FALL APART

SOME CONCLUSIONS

Lord Kinnoull's embassy came at a time when the whole stance of the Ottoman Empire *vis-à-vis* the European powers was changing, for reasons relating to both internal and external affairs. After Carlowitz, the Ottomans, no longer able to rely on military power alone, found they had to adopt a defensive position to the west. This resulted in a gradual engagement in the European system of diplomacy, negotiation and mediation, usually through the office of the grand vizier, and the erosion of the Ottoman notion of the absolute superiority of the dar-ul-Islam (that is the realm of Islam, where Islamic values and norms are accepted). As a consequence, the European ambassadors' role became more significant in Constantinople, with the Porte at something of a disadvantage because of its lack of Ottoman representatives in European capitals.

Internal problems also gave rise to difficulties. For instance, it is clear that the janissaries resented their loss of status within the Empire, with negotiation and mediation playing a greater part in the Porte's external relations than the traditional military power. The system of life-term tax farming rather than the shorter periods granted before 1696 gave more power to the already wealthy and powerful at court; this resulted in excessive tax demands being made on the lower classes to support the extravagant lifestyle adopted by some grandees during the Tulip period. The wars with European powers resulted in the Ottoman Empire's loss of various border territories; those dispossessed of their land tended to move into the cities and were blamed for disorders such as the 1730 rebellion led by Patrona Halil, himself an Albanian immigrant. Another reason for tension was that the European traders were increasingly to be seen within the Empire using their country's favourable trading terms under the Capitulations system; their ability to sell *berats* or tax concessions to other foreigners put the local Muslim merchants at a disadvantage and in the long run meant a loss of income to the state coffers.²⁰³

So the role of an ambassador to the Porte in the first half of the eighteenth century was likely to require a degree of judgement, experience and diplomatic skill, given the various pressures arising from the shifting balances of power within the Empire. It therefore seems fair to conclude that, in the circumstances, Kinnoull was by no means a suitable choice for the post. Why the Duke of Devonshire thought it appropriate to recommend him in the first place is not clear, but it may well be that Kinnoull's appointment had more to do with a perceived need to remove him from London than with any qualification for the job. In addition, in

1729 the Secretary of State may have decided there was no particular reason to foresee that Constantinople would prove a difficult posting that required great diplomatic skills.

So far as the Levant Company was concerned, Kinnoull was at a disadvantage from the start, with a number of the London merchants being uneasy about his appointment. His total lack of knowledge of the Company's commercial activities was a severe handicap in terms of the practicalities of doing justice to this important aspect of his job and gaining local respect in the trading, and hence the embassy community. This was a time when English merchants were feeling threatened by the expansion of the French cloth trade within the Ottoman Empire, and so would have valued an ambassador who had a greater appreciation of the difficulties they were experiencing.

Once Kinnoull had reached Constantinople, his lack of experience soon became evident. It transpired that there was a need for a man with substantial diplomatic skills, to be able to compete with seasoned diplomats like Neplyuev, Thalmann and Villeneuve. It seems fairly clear that Neplyuev and Thalmann, working together, were determined to neutralize Kinnoull or get rid of him altogether from an early stage. Already, in January 1731, Thalmann had formed the view, perhaps with some justification, that Kinnoull was but putty in the hands of Villeneuve; certainly, Kinnoull seemed naïvely unsuspecting of the Frenchman initially, describing him as an open-hearted man with no tricks in his dealings. Could Thalmann and Neplyuev have concluded that Kinnoull's family connections with the Jacobite cause would incline him to favour the French in the shape of both Villeneuve and Bonneval? It is a possibility, but there is no direct proof of such a supposition.

In terms of the diplomatic activity required of him, Kinnoull might have survived had it not been for the outbreak of the War of the Polish Succession. As the Russian and Austrian allies' irritation with Walpole's stance on the War of the Polish Succession increased, Thalmann and Neplyuev evidently decided that if Kinnoull was not actively anti-French then he was effectively on the enemy's side and any potential influence he might have with the Porte was against their interests. They were particularly annoyed by Kinnoull's unsuccessful attempt to avoid the Vienna censorship system by sending communications to England, including the Grand Vizier's letter to the King, via Riso. Thus they concocted exaggerated and inaccurate complaints which, combined with information from the mysterious 'good hand at Constantinople' and with

the lack of grip indicated by the Monier and Pisani affair, successfully destroyed Kinnoull's credibility with the King.

A further reason for Kinnoull's difficulties was the fact that, unfortunately for him, he coincided with Calkoen who had a reputation in diplomatic circles of being exceptionally difficult to get on with; yet it was particularly important that they should work together in their diplomatic stance in relation to the War of the Polish Succession. It was doubly unfortunate that it was to Calkoen that Monier inevitably turned on being sacked, so making reconciliation between the two ambassadors yet harder to achieve. The whole business of dealing with his secretaries and dragomans showed Kinnoull's inability to manage others, and his tendency to misjudge their characters. Doubtless, he was out of his depth and naïve about the reliability and confidentiality of information, incoming and outgoing, through dragomans; to be fair to him, he did frequently ask for additional funds to match the bribes offered by others and it may well be that his failure to retain the loyalty of Monier and Pisani was of financial origin.

In Kinnoull's defence, he was heavily handicapped by the hopelessly slow and insecure methods of communication with England, so that he was always several months out of date as regards information on policy and the changing diplomatic climate and even further behind in being able to gauge reactions to his own letters. However, these disadvantages in communication were common to most other diplomats in Constantinople at the time, so Kinnoull's failure cannot be attributed only to lack of instructions from London.

Various other aspects of Kinnoull's character conspired against him. For instance, his naïvety was displayed again in his association with Stadnicki and with von Höpken and Carleson who shared his taste for good living and social hospitality, thus diverting him from the niceties of diplomacy. Probably, he was much easier to get on with in the social context, where he would have felt in control, than professionally, where he would have lacked confidence. Indeed, de Saussure said that Kinnoull could be agreeable, adopting a pleasing manner when he wished: '*cette politesse attrayante dont'il sait si bien se server quand le veut.*'²⁰⁴

However, an unfortunate trait that Kinnoull displayed during his time in Constantinople was a tendency to drink too much. Fawkener told Newcastle that: 'In the freedom of wine he [Kinnoull] is very apt to forget himself.' This is confirmed by de Saussure who wrote to a friend that he did not really like living in the British embassy with Kinnoull

because the meals were long-drawn-out and boring and often involved excesses that he did not care for.²⁰⁵

Kinnoull's undignified delay in returning home, while he scratched about for funds in his final months in Constantinople, was doubtless partly brought on by his own mismanagement of money although, in his defence, the inadequacy of the way the embassy was financed was noted by both his predecessor and his successor. His successor, Sir Everard Fawkener, was able to supplement his funds considerably through having the opportunity to act as a mediator between France, Russia, Austria and the Ottoman Empire; Kinnoull did not have such a chance. It might be felt that he had little excuse for getting himself so heavily in debt, given his evident extravagance as regards entertaining. But he doubtless genuinely felt that he must compete, in this area, with other embassies that were more generously financed. In any case, in the end, despite grumbling, the Levant Company appears to have covered these expenses.

There may have been other reasons for his delayed homecoming in that he must have been dreading having to face his family and friends at home, with his return preceded by stories of disgrace over the performance of his duties and probably also with regard to his personal life. He very much hoped that, before his arrival home, he might be offered another post, perhaps the governorship of Barbados, given his family's connections with the island, to enable him to rebuild his reputation and his finances. Perhaps also his relationship with Judith Sabreau presented him with further emotional and practical problems without easy solutions.

Unfortunately, Samuel Medley gives us neither praise nor criticism of his master, but only the loyalty to be expected of an elderly butler. We cannot know if Medley would have agreed with Fawkener that Kinnoull was 'the most incompatible character I yet ever saw'.²⁰⁶

5

Samuel Medley, Butler

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY butlers' diaries or day journals, such as Medley's, seem to be few and far between. Matthews (*British Diaries: an annotated bibliography of British diaries written between 1442 and 1942*) records just two domestic staff diaries (a butler and a steward) begun and written between 1695 and 1750; there are also the exceptional reminiscences of a much-travelled footman, John Macdonald.¹

But there is yet a further, even more unusual dimension to the manuscript of Samuel Medley in that, opposite the pages of the diary, he wrote out excerpts from his extensive and wide-ranging reading: these will be explored in the subsection below on *Samuel Medley's reading matter*. Also, as we shall see in the subsection beneath that on *Samuel Medley's faith*, Medley ventured into poetry composition and that, too, seems to have been unusual for a butler. Various female servant poets have been noted, but so too have Robert Dodsley (born in 1703), a poet and dramatist who started writing poetry as a footman, and John Lamb, the father of Charles and Mary, a footman-poet educated through his employer's library.²

First, though, let us look in more detail at Medley's day-to-day reporting of his life in the employment of Lord Kinnoull.

AT HIS EXCELLENCY'S SERVICE

Throughout his diary, Medley appropriately – but unfortunately from the reader's point of view – maintains absolute discretion in all his observations regarding his master, which are strictly factual in nature. Never does he allow himself any note of criticism of, or indeed opinion on, any of his master's actions or activities; almost always he avoids using possible adjectives and adverbs to describe them.

He usually refers to Lord Kinnoull as either 'His Excellency' or 'My Lord', normally abbreviating these to 'His Ex-y' and 'My L^d'. Briefly, he reports his master's movements: 'His E-y ... Cam from Belgrade' or

‘went for Pera’ or ‘Rid to Buctree’.³ In the same simple style, he reports visits by, and to Lord Kinnoull: ‘My L^d vizited’ (usually one or other of the ambassadorial palaces; occasionally ‘In full Ceremony’ and ‘wth all of us his Retinue’ if it was a visit requiring such respect to be shown); ‘The ... amb^r vizited my L^d’ or ‘Dind with My L^d’ or ‘Came to waite on his Ex-y’ (preceded by names of one or more ambassadors or other visitors).⁴

He also reports on Lord Kinnoull’s social activities, as well as official social duties – although a distinction between the two would often have been hard to make. But particularly at Belgrade, Kinnoull seems, though only very occasionally, to have felt himself to some extent off duty: ‘His Ex-y went to a ball in the Evening at the Venetian palace’; ‘My L^d at Church’; ‘His Ex-y wth the workmen in y^e garden all day’; ‘My L^d Rid out a Spassa [excursion]’ or simply ‘Rid out to take the air’.⁵

We have noted, in Chapter 4, that Kinnoull seems to have enjoyed, too often for the good of his reputation, the (somewhat diplomatically dangerous) company of the Pole Stadnicki (whom Medley misidentifies as ‘Kinsky’ or ‘Kininsky’) and the Swedes, von Höpken and Carleson:

15 March 1734

My L^d Rid out a Spassa wth Count Kinsky Barron Zy. & many of His Ex-ys Retinue & had a very great Entertainment at their return.

6 May 1734

His Ex-y M-m M^r Carlson y^e Sweed walked to y^e G^d Sen^{rs} Keeosk a fishing – & Returnd in y^e Evening.

And there is an occasional off-duty feel to dinner at Pera, as on 7 April 1734: ‘Palme Sunday – no Meeting at Church – the two Sweeds Gentlemen & many others Dind & Suppt with his Ex-y – musick &c. Evening.’

When he and his master are in the same place, he reports, almost every day on His Excellency’s meals, in which of course he has a particular interest: ‘His Ex-y Entertaind’, followed by a list of guests⁶ (and, in this context, he does allow himself an occasional compliment such as ‘a very good Hansome Entertainment’, ‘a Great & noble Entertainment’, ‘a Magnificent Suppr and Entertainmt’ and even, once, uses the adjective ‘Sumptuous’). Regrettably, details of menus are not included, though on Good Friday, 12 April 1734: ‘We had nothing but fish to Diner.’

There were special celebrations, which worried the Levant Company

on account of the expense, as we have noted in the section on *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3 in the case of the King's birthday; sundry dining opportunities for friends (though relatively few for other ambassadors); Sunday entertainments for the merchants and other visitors; and, on one occasion (23 February 1734): 'His Ex-y had a Ball in the Evening a very fine Entertainment Musick &&.'

Dinner times were variable, to say the least: 'His Ex-y Dind', 'at 2', 'at 3', 'at 4', 'at 5', 'at 6', 'at 7', 'at 8', 'at 9' or even, on one occasion, 'at past 12 a clock at night'. He dined 'in the Great Dineing Room' (at Pera), 'in y^e Low Hall' (at Pera), 'in M-ms hall' (i.e. Madam's hall, also at Pera – this could be the same as the Low Hall), 'in the Bed Chamber', 'in privat' or 'His Ex-y did not dine'; alternatively, or in addition, 'His Ex-y Suppt'.⁷

Direct intercourse with his master is seldom mentioned but on three occasions he did receive money⁸ directly from Kinnoull:

Tuesday 18 June 1734

Rec'^d fifteen Doller of my L^d on acc^t.

2 December 1734

Rd 10 dollors of my L^d.

15 December 1734

I Rec'd this Morning twenty Venetian Zequeens of My L^d.

It is unclear whether these were a part of Medley's wages, as may be suggested by the use of the phrase 'on acc^t' in the first quotation, or simply presents or tips. It would be more usual for the steward to pay the butler. As ever, he avoids any adjectives or adverbs in describing the handouts.

Medley tells us almost nothing about his everyday duties as a butler. We should expect him to have been in charge of the wine cellar, to have known his vintages and to have served the wines – some indication of the likely size of the wine cellar may be gained from the information we have on Stanyan's very substantial cellar, lost in the embassy fire (see *Diplomatic matters* in Chapter 3). However, there is hardly any mention of wine in the whole diary and no mention of types of wine or vintages. He does, however, opposite the entry for 18 February 1734, provide a note on how to avoid wasting corked wine: 'a Recp^t – to make prict wine good

vinegar – Boyle Kindney beans – & – put In the watter – they was boyld in.’

We should also expect him to have been responsible for the pantry, where he does admit to be dining with friends from time to time, and in charge of the glass and plate, but there is no mention of either. He was involved in purchasing food from time to time, which should normally not have been his preserve, as we shall discuss in the subsection below entitled *The butler and the steward*, but there is no clear indication of whether or not any of the purchases were made on his own initiative. He also waited at table occasionally, but he notes such occurrences as if they were not the norm: that should have been the footman’s job,⁹ apart from the service of wine. In fact, of the eight occasions when he reports being ‘in waiting on’ or ‘waiting for’ his Lordship, it is never entirely clear that he is waiting ‘at table’, rather than standing in for his colleague Mr Brown in the gentleman-in-waiting role; it is only clear that he is waiting ‘at table’ on the two occasions he reports doing so ‘in M-m’s hall’.¹⁰

When Sir Everard Fawkener arrived at the end of 1735, Medley soon found himself running to and fro between the embassy and his master’s new abode in the old Russian embassy and, as we saw in *The new ambassador’s arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4 above, being involved in some of the new ambassador’s official functions. He notes Sir Everard’s presence at church and Kinnoull’s visits to Sir Everard:

18 January 1736

Both the ambⁿ at Church – M^r Pain Preacht a Sermon.

18 April 1736

Palme Sunday my L^d dind wth S^r Evrard – I went to wait for him.

Also, he and Mr Clark the steward were evidently made welcome in their old domain by Sir Everard’s servants:

23 December 1735

Exceeding Could Morning frost & Snow I dind wth M^r falconers Servants.

Wednesday 24 December 1735

More Snow & mor Could I dind at S^r Ev-d^s pallace – & did not Stir out from y^e gate.

Monday 20 September 1736

M^r Clark came here for provitons – wee Both Supt at S^r Ev-s

‘MADAM’ AND MRS SANDYS

It was not until 17 January 1734 that someone to whom Medley referred as ‘M---m’, ‘my Mistress’, or occasionally ‘My Lady’ or ‘My Mrs’ or ‘Madam’, first makes an appearance in the diary. It seems likely that she had been present in Pera or more probably out at Belgrade village since Medley began his diary on 16 October 1733, but that he simply did not mention her. On 17 January 1734, however, he says: ‘More Snow – all day – His Ex-y M---m Mrs S[and]ys – near – all My L^{ds} Retinue Came from Bellgrade village – In the Evening – a very dangerous pasage – But got all well home BbG [Blessed be God].’

Pamela Horn, author of *Flunkeys and Scullions*¹¹ and of a range of impressive social history books, who has kindly read all the diary entries concerned with ‘Madam’, has taken the view that she is likely to have been ‘a housekeeper and companion’, or possibly a ‘poor relation’ – perhaps a cousin – fulfilling a role between a paid retainer and a member of the family. She may otherwise have been the widow or daughter of a gentry family that had fallen on hard times. Such a superior social status would explain why the butler referred to her as ‘Madam’ or ‘My Mrs’, i.e. my mistress.

In his study of aristocratic kinship and domestic relations in eighteenth-century England, Trumbach points out that first among the upper female servants were the lady’s woman and the housekeeper, and that the lady’s woman, at least:

was sometimes a gentlewoman. ... The housekeeper’s role could simply be to manage the maids ... but her role could also be much greater. Lord Bristol did not have a house steward but used a housekeeper instead. Lady Stanhope’s housekeeper supervised the maids, controlled the kitchen, cared for the furniture, sent the servants to church, and yielded to the butler only in control of the footmen. A housekeeper, indeed, could become a substitute mistress.¹²

We do indeed, however, know that in his final years, after the death of his wife, Lord Kinnoull lived at Ashford in Middlesex and was looked after by a widow, Mrs Judith Sabreau, to whom he left the Ashford house

and its contents.¹³ It was her daughter, Ann Sabreau, who was married in March 1731¹⁴ to William Sandys by Mr Payne, the Levant Company chaplain. Sandys was Kinnoull's private secretary and, from 1730, the *Cancellier* or Chancellor of the Levant Company merchants. Ann is the 'Mrs Sandys' of Medley's diary, who was so often noted as being in the company of 'Madam' and was the sole beneficiary of Judith Sabreau's will.¹⁵

It seems almost certain therefore that we can identify 'Madam' as Judith Sabreau. We do not know whether or not she travelled to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party because the ship's role lists men only.¹⁶ However, if, as seems likely, she was the lady Calkoen referred to as Kinnoull's 'mistress', she was present in early November 1730¹⁷ and so it is highly likely that she travelled out with him.

Medley notes that Captain Petrie of the Levant Company ship, *Tigress*, 'Supt wth M-m' on 18 February 1734 (possibly because his Lordship was still 'Indisposed' as he had been the previous evening) but she is not mentioned again until 13 April, when she joined a sightseeing tour to Constantinople. Medley was buying cherries for her on 3 May and there was a retreat to Bellgrade village the next day, 4 May 1734:

I Rid wth My L^d waggons No 8 – to Bellgrade village – along wth a Janesary to Guard them – His Ex-y M-m & the two Sweeds Gentn & many of ye Retinue Came to ye village in the Evening – I was about 9 hours on hors Back – but very well Blessed be my god.

Out at the village, there were various expeditions in the company of Kinnoull, but 'Madam' would also set off on excursions independently. On Thursday 16 May 1734: 'M-m Mrs S-ys Mr Carlson &c. went a fishing to the Keosk – in the Morning – His Ex-y followed ym & dind there.' Lord Kinnoull returned to Pera together with 'Madam' on 4 June 1734, stopping off at a favourite dining venue: 'His Ex-y M-m the 2 Sweeds Gentn & many of ye Retinue went to dine at Gendry medows & from thence to the Pallace at pera.' They were both back in the village from 12 June, dined out with Count Stadnicki on the 13th, and returned to Pera via Gendry meadows again on the 21st, where they stayed until 25 July. On 31 August, when 'M-m' was at Pera, Medley had occasion to say that 'I writ to M-m'.

Otherwise, 'Madam' is then mentioned through August and September only as accompanying his lordship to Pera or back to Belgrade, or socializing with Stadnicki at home or away. For example on

27 September 1734, 'Count Kininsky vizited My L^d wn at Diner – I walked to y^e Bird place my L^d &c there wth M-m the Count &c Evening.' On Friday 18 October 1734 there was a sightseeing trip when: 'His Ex-y M-m &c. went a Spaso to ovids tower & Returnd in the Evening.' On 22 October 1734, Medley mentions 'M-m' in the context of the return to Pera; he himself had been continuously in Belgrade since 4 May: 'His Ex-y M-m & all of us the Retinue came to pera – I having ben now 6 month there [i.e. at Belgrade].'

Medley notes that, when at Pera, more often than not Kinnoull dined 'in M-ms hall', sometimes with visitors also, and presumably 'Madam' was normally dining there with him; in fact, the exception is noted on 13 December 1734: 'the Shortest day Call St. Lucy His Ex-y Dind aloon In his Closet m-m dind in her hall.' Attention is also drawn to occasions when His Excellency is out so that Medley waits upon 'Madam':

30 January 1735

a very wett Could time His Ex-y Dind at the french pallace – M-m dind & I waited – the dutch amb^r had a Ball this night.

6 February 1735

His Ex-y vizited the venetian amb^r afternoon – I waited on my M^s at diner.

There were occasional opportunities for 'Madam' to make excursions from Pera with Kinnoull:¹⁸

Saturday 22 February [1735]

His Ex-y Count Kininsky M-m & many of the Retinue Rid out a Spassa – Being a very fine day & Returnd in the evening.

7 June 1735

His Ex-y m-m & many Gentⁿ – Rid out a Spassa to Gendry.

Saturday 11 October 1735

His Ex-y m-m – B[aron] Hopp[kin]s – Mr Carlson &c went a Spasa by water & Supt here on Return.

Also, Medley mentions opportunities for 'M-m' to dine out, notably with Count Stadnicki or with the Swedes; there is never any mention,

however, of her joining Kinnoull to dine out with the French, Dutch, Russian or German ambassadors:

13 June 1734

My L^d M-m Barron Hoppkins Mr Carlson &c. dind wth Count Kinsky [i.e. Stadnicki] in y^e other village.

31 October 1735

Much Rain very could my L^d & m-m Supt at the Sweeds p[al]a[ce].

15 April 1736

my L^d & madam dind in y^e ship.

Medley does not record 'Madam' as having dined at the more important embassies. Diplomatic wives came to dine at the British palace, and Medley mentions Madame de Villeneuve in this connection in 1734. Kinnoull hosted a dinner for the Austrian Resident Mr Thalmann and his new bride on 28 April 1731 on the occasion of their marriage, while in February 1732, 'Mr Neapleof, the Muscovite Resident and his lady' dined.¹⁹

There are few entries of consequence concerning 'Madam' in the last year of the diary and, in any case, it ceases on 9 November 1736. Lord Kinnoull and the rest of his party finally left Constantinople on 2 May 1737 and we do not know for certain if 'Madam' accompanied them.

After January 1734 Mrs Sandys, often abbreviated to 'Mrs S-ys', appears frequently in the diary in the company of her mother, 'Madam'. They went riding with the ambassador's party to 'Gendry meadows', went on excursions and occasionally crossed the water to Constantinople to see the 'tourist' sights such as Santa Sophia. Medley records some of these outings, for instance on 13 April 1734: 'His Ex-y M---m Mrs S-ys Mrs Cl[ar]k - y^e 2 Sws Gentⁿ Mr Monere Mr Lyle Jnr - & Most of us of the Retinue of my L^d past over to Constantinople Erly in the morning.' Sometimes Mrs Sandys came from Pera to be with the 'family' and joined their expeditions:

Tuesday 7 May 1734

Mrs Sandys Came from Pears - In y^e Chaire wth Barron Hoppkins the Sweeds Gentⁿ - towards Evening a wett hazy day.

Friday 10 May 1734

His Ex-y & the two Sweeds Gentⁿ M-m M^s S-y^s & others went a fishing to y^c Grand Senirs Keeosk – after Diner & Returnd In the Evening – I walked a mile to meet them.

Sunday 23 June 1734

M^r Monere & M^s Sandys Dind wth Count Kininsky at y^c other village I walked out in y^c Evening.

Wednesday 3 July 1734

Mrs Sandys went for Pera this Morning – In an arraba – & an other arraba wth her houshold goods.

William and Ann Sandys had rooms in the embassy, something to which Sandys was entitled as *Cancellier*. When Sandys had returned to England, evidently his wife continued to live in the embassy or at the Belgrade house until the episode when, Calkoen tells us, she was found by her mother in Kinnoull's bed, at the end of May 1734.²⁰ After Monier's dismissal in July 1734, Ann disappears from the diary apart from one final entry when she left for England.

Ann Sandys was clearly a capable lady. After her husband went home on his father's death in September 1731, she saw to the sale of their household goods to pay off debts and eventually travelled back to England in 1735 in the *Tigress*, the Levant Company ship commanded by Captain Petrie. On Thursday 21 August 1735 'Mrs Sandys – went wth Capⁿ Peter to his Ship the Tigress at Conncapee in order to Saile to Joppa – & then for England.'

SAMUEL MEDLEY'S COLLEAGUES AND FRIENDS

The butler and the steward

In the context of this overseas posting, there was an extra complication in that both the embassy at Pera and the retreat in Belgrade village had to be staffed, and it was not always convenient to keep moving the whole retinue from one to the other. We have to bear this in mind while trying to deduce whose job was normally what.

We have already noted, in the Introduction, the first entry in Medley's diary:

A Journal Begun this 16th day of October 1733 – Tuesday – Being the Day that Compleats 4 years Since I Came on Board Mr Addames Sloope at Wapping New Stairs and Entered Into the Retinue of his Excellencie the Earl of Kinnoull as his Stoor keeper & Cheife Buttler But at this time Groome of the Chambers.

This ambiguous statement must actually mean that he joined Lord Kinnoull as ‘Groome of the Chambers’ in 1729 and, by 1733, was ‘Stoor keeper & Cheife Buttler’.

The role of groom of the chambers tended to be largely ceremonial and the appointment was normally restricted to rich families. Lord Kinnoull might well have thought it appropriate to include one in his retinue to impress the other ambassadors. The practical responsibilities were primarily concerned with care of the furniture, fires and candles and he would normally have ranked lowest among the male upper servants, in other words below the butler and the valet.²¹ While it seems to have been more usual to appoint a young man to this role,²² Lord Kinnoull may have had special reasons for wanting to include Medley in his party and, given his evident good character and reliability, it seems not surprising that Medley was in due course promoted to butler.²³

As butler, Samuel Medley would have been answerable to the steward who, for most of the period covered by Medley’s diary, seems most probably to have been Mr William Clark (sometimes spelt Clarke). However, he first appeared in November 1733 and, prior to that (with a final entry on 30 October) a certain J. German seems to have been doing the job. There was also one mysterious entry later on suggesting that Clark may, for some reason, have suffered some temporary disgrace and then been reinstated because the entry on 19 October 1735 stated that: ‘M^r Clark put in Steward again yesterday.’

As steward,²⁴ one may suppose that Clark would have been responsible for keeping the accounts and paying wages; purchasing provisions; hiring and directing liverymen (inferior servants such as footmen) and fitting them out with livery; overseeing the butler, clerk of the kitchen, male cook, gardener, baker, confectioner and groom of the chambers. He would have reported directly to Lord Kinnoull and normally have been at his elbow at dinner. He would very probably have had an office and a bedroom in the embassy, but he also had his family with him – his wife, a son Billy and a daughter Betsy. It is not clear where they lived. In Medley’s diary, they are most in evidence when everyone is at Belgrade

village and, since that was a much more pleasant and healthier place than Pera, they may well have lived there. However, Mrs Clark is also mentioned in the context of Pera on several occasions.

As we have said, as butler,²⁵ Medley would have been responsible for the pantry and wine cellar, which would have meant knowing about vintages, and in charge of glasses and plates. However, we should not be surprised at an eighteenth-century butler, particularly in the unusual context of this overseas post, undertaking a wide range of jobs. As Turner points out, 'In the eighteenth century the duties of butler, valet and footman were not so sharply differentiated as they became in Victorian times.'²⁶ Indeed, Richard Cartwright, butler to Nicholas Blundell of Lancashire, certainly had an extremely broad remit, not restricted to conventional butlers' duties, and he 'occupied a position of trust in the family'. Blundell notes that he sent him off to sell some apples; asked him to climb 'some Chimneys for young Swallows'; helped him capture 'some bees on y^e granary stayres', had him curl a wig; helped him pitch and stop a window letting in the wet; sent him to bottle some wine and to buy some lead for the gutters; asked him 'to trace Rabets in the snow', 'to trim trees' and to 'read old writings' to him. He was also skilled in blood-letting and performed this service for his master and mistress.²⁷

Being also responsible for the deft and punctilious service of the wine, the butler would usually have been a man with 'a becoming carriage'.²⁸ 'The butler wore no livery but was attired in formal clothes distinguished by some deliberate solecism – the wrong tie for the coat, or the wrong trousers – to prevent his being mistaken for a gentleman. ... He was addressed, always, by his surname.'²⁹

Conventionally, there would have been a clerk to the kitchen responsible for ordering 'the provisions for the table, negotiating with the butcher, the baker and the greengrocer, and disbursing funds allocated by the house steward for the payment of those tradesmen'.³⁰ Under the clerk to the kitchen would normally be the man cook, unless these two roles were combined, in which case 'the whole process of making up menus, buying victuals, preparing and serving meals was his responsibility, and his alone'.³¹ However, as we shall see, from the functions Clark carried out, it appears that the posts of steward and clerk to the kitchen were in this situation combined. (If we were to assume that Clark was in fact clerk to the kitchen and man cook combined, and that there was another person as steward, there is no one who appears in the diary likely to fit that role.)

There was an extensive period, from when the diary starts on 16 October 1733 until 4 May 1734, when both Medley and Clark were based at Pera, while Kinnoull was away at Belgrade until 5 November and then away there again from 23 November to 11 December and for four nights in January. On 4 May 1734, it appears that both Medley and Clark moved, with Kinnoull, out to Belgrade and remained there through the summer to 22 October, while Kinnoull was based at Pera from 4 June to 25 July, from 26 August to 6 September and for three nights in October. On 4 June 1734 Medley writes: 'His Ex-y ... went to ... the Pallace at pera – I am Left 5 Servants Governour here at Bellgrad.' Presumably, what he meant here was that he was left with five servants who were answerable to him personally, for Mr Clark was still among those remaining at Belgrade. If Medley had been made acting steward at that time, surely he would have noted it?

However, Clark may have been in the habit of delegating to Medley, given that they were often in different places. When the diary starts, Medley is in Belgrade while Kinnoull and probably Clark also are at Pera, so that when (opposite 30 October 1733) the laundryman needs paying: 'I pd Tomazo all off for Washing – & 30 peraws over.' From 22 October 1734 Medley was again based back in town at Pera, but this time Kinnoull decided to keep Clark out at Belgrade, so he disappears from the diary entries for roughly the next four months. In Kinnoull's final months in Turkey, there was the further complication of a move from the embassy to the old Muscovite palace to make room for the new ambassador, and so Medley found himself rushing to and fro between the two palaces; Clark returned to Belgrade for a while in 1736 and in the entry for 4 September that year we read: 'My L^d and all the famaly went for Bellgrade villa – I & the Capigee left to govern this pallace at pera.' Quite how Clark, in particular, managed to do his job and keep control of the accounts and provisions, and how Kinnoull managed for long periods without both a steward and a butler is unclear. However, the solution probably lay in a Mr Brown whom we shall meet in the next section.

There was clearly a close relationship between the steward and the butler and Medley often kept Clark company, both socially and in the performance of his duties. There are 88 diary entries referring to Clark and/or his family and he comes across as a good companion and colleague whose company Samuel Medley much valued. They went on joint excursions to purchase provisions:

Saturday 8 June 1734

I walked ... to y^e other village wth Mr Clark & Bought Some oyle.

Tuesday 16 July 1734

I walked in y^e morning wth Billy Clark – to the other village to buy some mutton – I walked to the fountain & B[owling] Green wth Mrs Clark & children – the fruit of y^e Garden went to pera in the arraba – Mr Barker & Mr Daeth came to y^e village – the Dutch ambasr came Evening.

Wednesday 17 July 1734

I went wth Billy Clark to the other villa[ge] to buy victuals in y^e morning I walked afternoon wth Mrs Clark & children to the other villa again – & after to y^e fountain and B green.

18 July 1734

I went wth Billy Clark to y^e other village to buy victuals:- & afternoon wth him to y^e hill in y^e wood – & to y^e fountain – miss Savages came to y^e village.

22 July 1734

I went to y^e other village wth Billy Clark to buy Some victuals – & also to y^e fountain all in y^e morning ... I walked In y^e Evening to y^e other village again wth Mr Clark & famally.

Thursday 29 August 1734

Mr Esperance & Mr Ruddy & another – In their Spasa lighted at our pallace – & stayd a while – I walked wth Billy Clark to y^e north wood – I was also twice at y^e other vilage & Bought Some Mutton.

30 August 1734

I walked wth Billy Clark – to y^e other village & Bought Some Mutton.

Wednesday 4 September 1734

W^m Clark Rid to Balchaque & Bought a Goose – I walked wth him Round the village afternoon.

It is evident that, with both of them in Belgrade and the master away, there was not a lot for them to do! The habit of accompanying the steward on shopping expeditions seems to have been developed before Clark took over the job from Mr German, however:

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

22 October 1733

I walked wth Dr Smith & J German to Galleta to topena – who Bought a Goose & some fish there was wth y^m also at Jackoos Taverem (a wine bar) afternoon a very cold wett time.

Thursday 25 October 1733

I walked alone to y^c w^r Tower & after wth J German to Galletta – to buy Provisions for Belgrade – went wth Dr Smith to Hillars in y^c Evening.

26 October 1733

I went to Galleta wth J German – Bought a Cupple of fowls & half an oake of Bacon – for diner.

There are records of food purchases made by Medley on his own, whether on his own initiative or possibly delegated by the steward, but they are infrequent:

16 October 1733

I walked wth Mr Matth & Dr Smith – to Galletta – to Buy Lemons.

28 June 1734

I walked to the other village & Bought a qr of mutton.

14 September 1734

I walked to the other village aloon to buy Cucumbers.

In the matter of cherries, however, perhaps he took orders from His Excellency or ‘Madam’ directly!

Friday 3 May 1734

I walked to topena & to Galletta – then over the water to Stamboll: Bought Some Cherries for M-m – & Came Back the Same way all alone – & Before diner.

5 June 1735

I walked after diner to topena & bought some Cherries for my L^d.

There were opportunities to dine out in Clark’s company. On Monday

26 November 1733, 'Mouns^r Raza -, the french Baker,- Entertaind us viz M^r Clark - My Self D^r Smith M^r J Matth &c - at Diner - very Plentifully.' There were also opportunities to dine in - whether at a 'second table', as would be normal, or actually at His Excellency's table, as a special Sunday privilege, is not clear:

Sunday 26 May 1734

M^r Pain Read Prayers in y^e Dineing Room - My L^d & the Merchants there - M^r Clark my Selfe M^r Wallace & they all Dind wth his Ex-y.

Sunday 6 April 1735

Sunday Easter day - His Ex-y at Ch-h forenoon & after all the merchants dind wth my Lord - M^r Hanger M^r pemberton M^r Stanton M^r Clarke - & y^e two M^s Savages & allso a Hungarian protestant officer & my Selfe. Comemorating the death & Resurrection of my Dear Redeem^r.

There were joint visits to auctions. On Thursday 31 January 1734, for example, 'I went after his Ex-y had dind to the auction again:- where Mr Clark & I Bought a dozen w^r hose Something old, - for 33 pence.'

One of the steward's responsibilities would have been the supervision of some alterations that were made to the garden at Belgrade. Medley took an interest in these and it seems that Clark may have delegated to him some supervisory duties:

Monday 8 July 1734

I walked to y^e Spring wth Billy Clark to y^e Sherapp house [wine bar] & to y^e workman in the Gard Severall times - no news from pera all this day.

9 July 1734

I was in y^e Garden wth y^e workmen 2 or 3 times and walked twice to y^e fountain - & to y^e Sherap house.

Wednesday 10 July 1734

I was in the Garden wth y^e workmen 4 or 5 times - I walked to the fountain twice - M^r Clark came from pera - & M^r Carlson also.

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

11 July 1734

I was in the Garden wth y^c workmen many times & walked to y^c fountain & B Green wth M^r Clark & Spous – & to Se y^c Dutch Pallace: Evening Billy Clark went to pera.

Friday 12 July 1734

In y^c Garden offten – I walked in y^c Evening to y^c other village – & Bought a qt^r of mutton wth M^r Linwood – M^r Carlson Returnd to Pera.

13 July 1734

I walked to y^c fountain & about a mile after – was in y^c Garden as usuall – Billy Clark Returnd from pera.

Sunday 14 July 1734

M^r Lynwood went to pera – I walked in y^c Garden twice & to y^c fountain & B Green wth M^r Clark & Spouse – Count Staninsky – & his priest Playing at Boules there.

There was the pleasure of sharing in Mr Clark's artistic pursuits – as a steward he might well have had some training as a draughtsman so that he could draw up simple plans for the house and garden:

Thursday 6 June 1734

I walked to the hill in y^c wood wth M^r Clark – who tooke y^c Prospect of the village.

7 June 1734

I was again to day wth Clark & wee dind ther viz on y^c hill.

26 June 1734

M^r paine came to Se M^r Clark & drank tea wth us & to se his picture wth M^r Clark was drawing – I walked twice to y^c Spring & B Green & was there wth the merchants M^r Clark &c.

There were excursions for fishing, shooting or simply walking:

Friday 21 June 1734

His Ex-y M-m Barron Hoppkins M^r Carlson – & many of my L^ds

Retinue – went for Pera – & to dine at Gendry medow by the way –
I walked – to y^e hill in the wood wth Mr Clark – his Spouse & son.

22 June 1734

I walked wth Mr Clark & Billy – a fishing.

Sunday 7 July 1734

I walked wth M^{rs} Clark & Billy & Betsy about a mile or 2.

3 October 1734

His Ex-y M-m & most of the Retinue went for pera – I walked wth
M^r Clarke about 5 mile a Shooting.

12 October 1734

I walked a mile wth M^r Clark a Shooting in the Evening.

Finally there was a family tragedy with which to sympathize:

26 June 1734

y^e M^r Clarks Child dyed at nurs.

Thursday 27 June 1734

M^r Clarks Child was buried nere y^e Greek Church in y^e other village
– Mr Pain Read the office – we was in all about 13.

Mr Brown and the giovani di lingua

Possibly answerable to the steward, but more probably taking orders directly from Lord Kinnoull, was the gentleman-in-waiting or *valet de chambre*. A Mr Brown appears to fulfil this role. He would have been responsible for Lord Kinnoull's dress and coiffure and would have accompanied him on excursions. Thus, one might expect that he should appear, from the diary, to be resident in the same place as Medley only when Kinnoull was also there, and that proves to be the case. It was not uncommon, in some households, for the valet to undertake house steward's duties and so it is reasonable to imagine that Brown would have stood in for Clark when the latter was not resident in the same place as Kinnoull.

Brown's shopping excursions, on which Medley was happy to join him, were concerned with dress:

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

28 March 1734

I walked wth Mr Brown to the Quarter Strad to buy Some Ribbon.

16 December 1734

M^r Brown & I went to Galleta to the Baz--r where he Bought Some Cloth from thence to Topena & home my L^d did not dine butt in his Cabinet.

Monday 23 December 1734

His Ex-y Dind at the french Pallace – I walked wth M^r Brown to Galletas Bazerleen [?] – where he bought a lineing for his New Cloth.

24 December 1734

I went wth M^r Brown & one of our Janesaries to Stamboll where Many things things was bought for his Ex-y^s use from thence wee went to Mon^r Esperances.

Friday 5 December 1735

I went wth Mr Brown to Constantinople to buy Cloath for my Lord in the forenoon – I dind at y^e other palace at 6.

With his specialized knowledge and contacts, he was a particularly useful companion when Samuel Medley wants to make clothing purchases for himself:

Tuesday 17 December 1734

a fine Moring. I walked to Galleta where Mr Bragioty came to me to asist me In buying Some Cloth for a Sute of Cloths – I walked after wth Mr Brown to Baptistas Taylor, & from thence to Mr Hillars where wee had a Bottle of wine &c. His Ex-y dind in his cabinet & Suppt at the Venetian Biloos

18 December 1734

I went to M^r Brigoty about the Lineing – and after wth M^r Brown to the french Taylor – His Ex-y dind in y^e Evening M-m^s Room.

It is not clear who Mr Bragioty (or Brigoty or various other spellings) may have been but he and his son dined with Kinnoull; earlier that year, Kinnoull wrote to Robinson, the English Resident in Vienna, sending

him 'A thousand thanks' for all he had done for Antonio Bragiotti – the son, presumably – in recommending him to Prince Eugene to be a *giovane di lingua* (that is a trainee interpreter)³² to the Emperor at Constantinople – 'his father is a particular friend.'³³ Medley notes that, on 15 March 1735, he was 'at the funerall of Mr Bragioties mother'.

Mr Brown also shared Medley's interest in auctions:

29 January 1734 (but wrongly dated 1733)

Tuesday I went wth M^r Brown to the auction in the Quarterstrada – my L^d Dind in the Evening.

6 January 1735

I went wth M^r Wallace & M^r Brown to the french pallace to an auction Continued there.

Medley saw less of Brown socially than he saw of Clark (Mr Brown merits 43 diary entries as against Clark's 88); there were still joint social excursions, but perhaps Medley was a bit wary of them:

11 February 1735

I went after diner wth M^r Brown to Captin Boltons Ship – at the key – M^r Brown got too much drink as did also my Selfe – Shrove Tuesday.

15 July 1735

I went wth M^r Brown to y^c Tigres Capⁿ Petrees Ship – after diner

Mr Brown could even be tempted to join Medley on one of his many walks and he took advantage of the fountain in a way that perhaps he had learnt from Medley!

9 June 1734

I walked to y^c Spring 3 times & washed in y^c Rivlet in y^c Evening – In all about 4 mile.

Saturday 3 August 1734

Senr Amilla dind wth my L^d – the french faulconer came to day – I walked to y^c fountain wth M^r Brown – who washed.

Medley seems to have shared a room with Mr Brown at one stage:

16 December 1735

M^r Brown & I Removed to M^r Temonies Roome – wth all our Things.

Wednesday 17 December 1735

I walked to y^e other palace forenoon – very cold & wet season – M^r Linwood M^r Brown & I Supt in our Roome.

‘Mr Temonie’, to whose room Mr Brown and Samuel Medley removed themselves, was Angelo Timone, another *giovane di lingua*, appointed in 1731 (at 100 dollars per annum, or nearly £15).³⁴ He does not appear in the diary in his own right but Medley attended the funeral of his Aunt and also possibly another more senior relative. On 25 January 1734:

I and three other officers went to the funeral of an old Gentlewoman one M^{rs} Timoney – about 100 years old: wth a dozen footmen of our L^{ds} Retinue – there was above 40 popish priests & Bishops – & as many torches – & 40 other candles – tho at 2 of the Clock afternoon a numerous train – and abundance of Strange Raggs of popery & superstion.

Messrs Matth, Humpheries, Lynwood and Wallace

Another good friend and colleague was Mr Jn^o Matth. His role seems mainly to have been fetching and carrying things between Pera and Belgrade, so he was probably simply a footman:

2 December 1733

M^r Paine Give us a Sermon – to day M^r Jn^o Matth went to Belgrade wth provitions.

18 May 1734

M^r Matth went to pera – & y^e wagons for provitions.

30 May 1734

M^r Matth went & Returnd from pera.

On the other hand, there is one diary entry in which Matth appears to be concerned about the purchase of wood and bricks, which suggests some more responsible role – unless, of course, it was Medley making the purchases, perhaps as a favour to the steward, and Matth was simply a

companion on the expedition. On Wednesday 3 September 1735: 'I went wth Mr Math to topena & to galleta & by water to y^c almedon at y^c top of y^c harbour to buy briks from thence to Cons-ple to buy wood – &c So to topena again – & home at night.' Most of the 48 diary entries, however, are concerned with social intercourse:

18 December 1733

I Breakfasted at y^c french Pallace wth M^r Matth.

20 August 1734

I walked wth M^r Matth to y^c B green afternoone.

Friday 11 April 1735

I Rid wth M^r Matth and M^r Brown to atmedon.

Then, on 18 October 1735, there is a mysterious entry that could suggest that Matth lost his job – 'Mr Jn^o math out again' – possibly as part of an economy measure by Kinnoull who was, by then, himself out of a job. In any case, it then appears that Matth obtained employment at the Russian embassy instead:

25 April 1736 Easter Sunday

I went to y^c moscovite pallace to se J Math: at M^r vizicoffs.

6 June 1736

I went to take Leave of M^r Math at y^c moscovite palace.

Mr Humpheris, 34 entries, all in or after July 1735, was evidently another colleague in some capacity and a frequent dining host or guest of Medley, Clark, Matth and, especially, Robinson, Wallace, Brown and Jones thereafter:

2 November 1735

M^r Pain Read prayers – my L^d Indisposd so not at Church – I dind wth M^r Humpheris & M^r Math Came to us – a fine bright day but very could – Ba-n Hop-s & M^r Carlson here Even.

Tuesday 30 December 1735

I dind wth M^r Humpheris & give 3 letters for England – to M^r Hanger.

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

18 March 1736

Thursday a Rany morning – I dind wth M^r Robison M^r Humpheries & J Matth there.

25 March 1736

calld Lady Day ... M^r Humpheries was twice at y^e other palace.

Another occasional walking and dining companion of Medley's was Mr Lynwood, when they were resident in the same place.

Thursday 1 November 1733

M^r Lynwood Came from Belgrade for provitions – a Rany Day.

2 November 1733

M^r Linwood Returnd wth provitions to Bellgrad a very Cold time.

24 November 1733

a Great Snow fell Last Night – M^r Linwood Sent two arrabas wth Provitions – to Belgrade.

28 April 1734

M^r Linwod went to Belgrade wth y^e 5 arabaes.

7 July 1734

M^r Linwood went to pera in y^e chair.

Mr Lynwood appears to have been of similar standing to Mr Matth, being mainly employed going to and fro between Pera and Belgrade. However, he is said to have had the power to have 'sent two arrabas ... to Belgrade', which suggests he may have been master of the horse, reporting directly to Kinnoull. As the century progressed it became more common to replace the Master of the Horse with a clerk to the stables, responsible to the steward, and Kinnoull might have adopted this arrangement if other embassies did likewise, but the fact that Medley is clearly used to hearing the job title 'Master of the Horse' perhaps suggests otherwise. On 7 November 1733 'His Ex-y Entertained a Black – Master of hors to the Spanish amb^r at Viena.'

There are 13 entries for a Mr Wallace and it seems clear that he was one of 'the family', although it is not clear what his particular role may

have been. For example, on Saturday 14 September 1734, 'M^r Math went this morning to pera in y^e Chaire – & Mr Wallace followed on horseback.' Apart from being a dining companion of Medley's, Wallace also accompanied him on various excursions:

24 September 1734

I was wth M^r Wallace a Bird catching.

4 January 1735

I went to the french pallace & Bought 19 handkircheifs at an auction there – M^r Wallace Bought a watch.

Friday 2 May 1735

I walked to y^e Asia Capⁿ Timms Shipp – where I & M^r Wallace dind.

It is not impossible that he could have been William Wallace, who acted as *Cancellier* in the interregnum between Sandys and Bland, and who is not specifically mentioned in that role by Medley. However, in terms of social standing, the *Cancellier* would be unlikely to be a personal friend of the butler.

Messrs Elliot, Bollange, Franceway et alia

Jn^o Elliot (four entries in June 1734 or earlier, one of which suggests he is likely to have been a colleague) and Bollange, who has only five entries, may also have worked under the steward. On 7 June 1735 'I went [with] Bollange to topena – to buy Some wood & provitions &c.' As with Mr Matth above, it is unclear whether it was Bollange or Medley who was buying the wood and provisions, but looking at the two entries together, it seems likely that it was Medley, making some purchase for the steward and taking Bollange as a companion.

Much the same applies to Mr Franceway (five entries), who accompanies Medley to Jackoos, but, in his company the next day, may or may not have been the one responsible for an attempt to buy a fish:

27 November 1733

a Keen frost – I walked – toward^r Evening – to y^e English Buriing Ground – wth Jn^o Math – & Franceway – & to Jackoos Taverem.

Wednesday 28 November 1733

I went wth M^r Fr—y to Constantinople – to buy a fish – but no such to be found – Returnd by topena.

Sadly, he did not survive long enough to reveal more of himself. On Saturday 2 March 1734 ‘M^r franceway died – in the night – being very well to all appearance before Bedtime.’ In fact, 2 March was a very bad day because ‘Mon^r Lacount the french steward [also] died: a worthy Generous Good natured man and my kind familiar good frind.’

A certain Batt Roos (or Bart. Rose according to the *Torrington’s log*)³⁵ was presumably on Kinnoull’s staff because he travelled out in his party and attended chapel, but we know nothing more about him.

Samuel Medley and other colleagues already mentioned also kept company with the baker, though he is relatively seldom mentioned:

29 July 1734

I walked in y^c Morning wth the Bakeer to Balchaque – a village 3 miles off.

22 January 1735

January 22d Wedensday 1734 [*sic*] I walked to galleta wth M^r Matth M^r Brown Capⁿ Hamshire the Baker &c.

Saturday 29 March 1735

I went after Diner wth y^c Baker to Hillars & Jackoos.

The baker appears to be the only person who managed to prevail upon Samuel Medley to lend him money; how he achieved the nick-name ‘our steward’ is not revealed:

6 April 1735 and 3 May 1735:

april 6 th 1734 (<i>sic</i>)	
Lent the Baker (our Steward as wee call him)	110 peraws
a peice of Gould	
april 20 Lent him two nesaloots –	62 p-s
May the 3 ^d to halfe a Glosster Cheese forty Six peraws	46 p-s
	5 dollor
Rec ^d one dollr	18 p-s

Then we have others whose entries show no evidence that they belonged to the ‘family’ other than that Medley and some of his colleagues associated with them socially. There is Porter (18 entries, all after 21 February 1736), Hillars (six entries) and Sesan (five entries) with whom Medley and some of his colleagues dined and similarly Jones (five entries after 22 February 1736), including Tuesday 24 February 1736 when: ‘I went wth M^r Jones to se the dervisches worship.’ Messrs Deval, Ruddy and Shermetts are perhaps in this same category but are mentioned only once each. Mr Ruddy called one day (29 August 1734), in Belgrade, when on a walk with Monsieur Esperance who, judging from the following mysterious entry, was sometimes also based within walking distance of Pera – possibly he was part of the French ambassador’s staff: on 14 January 1735 ‘I walked wth Capⁿ to Dollmabatch to topena and Galleta – & calld at Esperances wth onely one Bottle.’

Mr Robi(n)son

‘Bobby’ Robinson (or Robison) and his wife and child (36 entries) were evidently good friends of Medley’s. Robinson exchanged hospitality with Medley and his friends and colleagues, notably Humpheries, Wallace, Brown and Jones, but we are told nothing about him and there is no indication that he himself was a colleague.

Sunday 25 November 1733

I Dind at Mr Hillars wth Jno Math – and wth him – in y^e Evening – at Mr Robisons – a B(owl) of Punch.

29 November 1733

I walked alone – towards Evening to the English Buriing Ground – Mr Robison & his Spouse – Suppt wth us – viz Dr Smith Jno Matth & My Selfe – in y^e Pantre.

23 March 1736

I Dind wth Mr Humpheries Mr Robinson & Mr Wallace there.

There is a grammatically peculiar entry, on Wednesday 7 May 1735, which may indicate that he worked for the merchant Barker: ‘His Ex-y Baron Hoppkins & most of my Lords Retinue Rid out a Spassa to Gendery – I went to Capⁿ Merchants & Captin Timmss Ships – & Returnd & dind wth Mr Robison – & his Chamber In Mr Barkers – I

Recd my gingerbread (?).’ The Robinsons suffered a tragedy in 1736: ‘Septembr 23d Thursday – I went to the funeral of Mr Robisons childe.’

Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants

Dr Smith (18 entries), who appears in some of the above quotations, seems likely to have been employed either by the Levant Company or possibly directly by Kinnoull, as physician. To Medley, he appears as a colleague and companion, with whom he walks, sups, goes to Jackoos:

Saturday 27 October 1733

I went wth J German & Dr Smith to see the Slucer: viz the German Smith wth whome wee din’d on Mutton Stakes Broyld on y^e forge hearth – I walked in the Evening wth J German to y^e Buriing Ground.

30 October 1733

I walked to Topena – and from thence by water to Dollmabash & so Round to the English Buriing Ground – and to Jackoos Serapp hous wth J German & Dr Smith.

Friday 30 November 1733

I walked wth Dr Smith – to Topena & Galleta – Mr Robison – wth us in the pantery – all y^e Evening – a B[owl] of punch.

Monday 3 December 1733

I was much Indispos’d all day I went wth D^r Smith to Jackoos towards night But was worss and went to bed Betimes.

Tuesday 4 December 1733

Much Better this morning B^d b m g g [Blessed be my good God] – I walked wth D^r Smith to the English Buriing Ground – Evening.

5 February 1734

I went on Board the Williams (in the Morning) wth D^r Smith – where we was verry well Entertaind.

Thursday 25 April 1734

I walked wth D^r Smith to Constantinople & Bought a pipe & some heads.

Dr Smith disappears after 6 July 1734 and there is no mention of a replacement until 29 March 1736 when ‘the new English D^r perry & M^r purrier dind wth my L^d.’

Among Medley’s friends, with whom he walked and dined from time to time, can be counted some of the Levant Company merchants and also the Chaplain employed by the Company, Thomas Payne, whose sermons he listened to on many Sundays and who may well have advised him on his reading matter.

17 July 1734

I dind wth M^r Barker – M^r Pain & M^r Death there.

4 October 1734

I walked alone & after with M^r Clark in y^e evening – & wth M^r Pemberton [a merchant].

28 September 1734

I dind wth M^r Madewell M^r Lyle M^r Barker ... [all merchants].

June 1734

I dind wth M^r Madewell D^r paine & young M^r Lyle there.

Thursday 6 November 1735

Very Could – I went to Se M^r Robison & dind wth him at M^r Barkers – & vizited M^r Pain.

Sunday 23 November 1735

I and Bobby dind wth M^r Humpheries at M^r Hangers.

Of those mentioned here, Barker, Maydwell, Hanger, Lyle and Pemberton were Levant Company merchants; these five were evidently happy to associate socially with Medley and also with Clark the steward: on 22 July 1734 ‘M^r Clark Dind with M^r Barker & y^e Rest of y^e merchants there.’

THE BUTLER OBSERVES

Lord Kinnoull’s staff

Of Kinnoull’s secretary, Louis Monier, Medley has nothing of significance to say beyond his brief reports, already quoted in Chapter 4, of his dismissal and of the assault on him after the Venetian ball.

However, as secretary, he had a room in the embassy and his efforts to keep warm in it in November did result in one near catastrophe. On 3 November 1733 'we all kept at home all day Being very Cold & Raney – day – the Chinney in M^f Monere^s Room hapened to take fire in y^e Evening. But no harm was don Blessed be God – wee being only frighted for halfe an houre in putting it out.'

Of the dragomans Luca Chirico and Antonio Pisani, much has been written in Chapter 4 and nothing relevant to their professional activities is noted by Medley other than Chirico's eventual discharge from service and replacement by Pisani, already quoted. Medley notes that Pisani, and also his father and his nephew, were, at one time or another guests of Lord Kinnoull, who also visited the family. Chirico ('Senr Luckas') is mentioned quite often in the contexts of Medley's walks to his vineyard or kiosk and Medley also notes sundry occasions when he visited or dined with Kinnoull, even including 6 May 1735, when 'Senior Lucka & his Spous & childeren dind wth his Ex-y.'

He also reports occasional visits by Kinnoull to the kiosk, such as 11 May 1734, which was 'a beautifull Bright Moring [and] – His Ex-y M-m Mrs S-ys – the 2 Sweeds Gentⁿ &c. walked after diner to Sr Luckas keosk – & vinyeard & Supt there In the Evening.' Thus we see that the dragomans were treated very much as part of the 'family'.

'Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff

While it was appropriate for Kinnoull to call on the Grand Signor and the Grand Vizier, by appointment only, they would not return the visit; similarly there were ceremonial visits to the Kaptan Pasha or Chief Admiral:

1 May 1734

His Ex-y wth all his Retinue went In the forenoon to vizeit y^e Capⁿ Bashaw – the Sweeds Barron Hopkins wth us: I Got a handkircheife: But of poor value.

29 April 1735

His Ex-y – wth all his Retinue – In Grand Ceremony – vized the Captin Bashaw on acc^t of his Going to Sea.

It was the dragomans of the highest officials who were charged with visits to Kinnoull but lesser officials might call or be invited to dine:

8 January 1734

at night my L^d Entertained the Second – or Cheife Deputy Custom master wth many other Gentlemen.

17 March 1734

the Druggerman of the Port vized His Ex-y – & Stayd here 3 houers.

18 January 1735

Captin Bashaws Druggerman vized My L^d about 2 a Clocke.

17 April 1735

A Great turk here & his Druggerman.

18 May 1735

the druggerman of y^e Port vized His Ex-y.

We have also seen that when Samuel Medley was in the same place as his master he observed the day-to-day visits by, and to other Residents and/or ambassadors, notably the Imperial Resident Baron Leopold Thalmann, ('Mr Tallman'); the Russian Resident Admiral Neplyuev ('Mr Nepleof' or similar) and his successor Veshnyakov ('Mr Visicoff' or 'Mr Visnicoff'); the Dutch ambassador Cornelius Calkoen, whose name eluded Medley; and the French ambassador, the Marquis de Villeneuve, who also went unnamed. Kinnoull, who found Thalmann 'very courteous',³⁶ wrote to Newcastle in 1731 that 'Thalmann has just married the daughter of a Mr Constantine, an English merchant in Turkey [aged] 30 years.'³⁷ From Medley, we later learn that on 6 January 1734, 'Madam Tallman Brought to bed of a Son' and, tragically, on 15 January 1734, 'the Emperours Envoy Mo^r Tallmans Childe Dyed Last night.' More typical of Medley's other observations on Thalmann, Neplyuev, Veshnyakov, and the French and Dutch ambassadors are simple reports of individual visits, home or away, such as the following:

2 January 1734

M^r Tallman – the Imp^l amb^r the french amb^r – the moscovite Envoy &c. all vized His Ex-y afternoon.

Thursday 1 August 1734

My L^d Rid Erly this moring wth many of his Retinue to dine wth y^e

french amb^r at Bucktree & Returnd in the Evening – wth the Polland Envoy.

8 October 1734

His Ex-y Dind at the Dutch palace Mr tallman & y^c Moscovites there and many others a Great feast – I waited on my L^d.

2 December 1734

His Ex-y Rid out to take the air & Mr viznicoff wth him & Returnd at night.

9 January 1735

His Ex-y Entertaind at diner the dutch amb^r the Imperiall Resident and his Lady the Moscovite Envoy & others: a fine Entertainment

As we have seen, the ambassador's level of spending caused the Levant Company in London to make objections. One wonders in this case why, after entries relating to the cost of entertaining other diplomats, the Company account book frequently states that these people had 'invited themselves to dine with His Excellency'.³⁸

Certainly, self-invitation could take on substantial dimensions on occasion. On 10 February 1733 Count Sierakowski, then the envoy extraordinary for Poland, came to dinner at the English palace, together with 'a very numerous retinue'. In fact, each and every one of them 'lay all night at the Palace, having no lodgings at Pera'.³⁹

Callers also came on a daily basis. A recurring entry in the Levant Company account book detailed: 'Wine, coffee, Rossolis, Perfume, Conserve of Roses, Tobacco and Pipes, spent on entertainment of strangers' during the three months previous. 'Sweetmeats given to great Turks' was another cost that occurred frequently.⁴⁰ Samuel Medley records these daily visits from ambassadors, merchants, sailors and the more important Turks throughout his diary.

There is one exceptional entry regarding the Dutch ambassador, Calkoen, who evidently impressed him (and others) with his generosity on one occasion on 2 March 1734: 'this day two of the men that Rob^d the dutch amb^r at Belgrade village the Last Octobr was Comdemnd to be Hang'd this day – but when the Ropes were about their necks & Reddy to be Executed the amb^r ordered a Repreive'.

'Generosity' is perhaps too generous a word. Under the Capitulations,

foreign ambassadors administered justice not only over their own nationals but also in any cases that involved their own possessions. In this case, the burglars, Bellinger and Erad by name, had stolen property from Calkoen's summer house and, when apprehended, were handed over to Calkoen. They were condemned to be hanged in the grounds of the Dutch embassy, but 'the Archbishops of Constantinople, of Naxos and of Nahsivan' interceded on their behalf and Calkoen pardoned them. As a result there was much 'marvelling at the great magnanimity of His Excellency', which cannot have done his reputation at the Porte any harm.⁴¹

Medley also notices other diplomatic visits, which, though of insufficient historical importance to have found their place in our account of Kinnoull's embassy, are nevertheless of interest.

Venice was well past its prime by the 1730s, preferring to stand neutral in relation to the European conflicts, but remained important in relation to trade; the ambassador, or *bailo* (or *biloo*), was treated with due respect. For example, on 10 September 1734, 'His Ex-y – went wth Many of his Retinue to dine with y^e venetian ambasad^r Somewhere near Buctree & also Count Kinisky' and on 28 October 1734, 'the Venetian amb^r & his Secretary – the po[pi]sh Bishop & a great many other Gentlem dind wth his Ex-y – a very Grand Entertainment'. This Venetian ambassador was Angelo Emo. Medley also mentions a Mr Dandilo as a visitor to Kinnoull from time to time, who was in fact Emo's Gentleman of the Horse, Dandallo.⁴² Emo, an experienced *bailo*, was about to retire:

Thursday 7 November 1734

His Ex-y made a vizit In full Ceremony – to y^e old venetian amb^r – where was finely Entertaind for about halfe an houer – my L^d Suppt in M- ms Hall wth M^r Dandilo the new major &c. there.

Sunday 17 November 1734

Much Rain wind &c M^r pain Read prayers – but 5 of us all at Chappell – His Ex-y Entertaind the old byloo & many of his Retinue wth a Magnificent Supp^r & Entertainmt.

By this time Emo's replacement, Contarini, had already arrived:

14 November 1734

The new byloo made his public Enetry this day.

Thursday 19 December 1734

His Ex-y Entertained at Diner the venetian amb^f the french amb^f & his Lady – the poland Envoy Count Kininsky & many others a very good Entertainment

Monday 13 January 1735

the druggerman of the port vizited His Ex-y about noon – My L^d wth all his Retinue paid a formall vizit in full Ceremony to the new Venetian amb^f.

20 January 1735

the Veneti amb^f vizited His Ex-y In Granduer as usesual on such ocasions and all the Merchants Druggermen & c. and a fine Entertainment Count Kininky Supp^t wth My L^d at 7 a clock.

The entertainment put on for Angelo Emo and his successor was perhaps excessive, for Kinnoull had given two dinners for each of them at a total cost of 336 dollars.⁴³ There may have been an element of competition here because Medley records an earlier splendid entertainment that the Austrian Resident held for the two Venetians on 24 October 1734: ‘His Ex-y Dind at y^e Imperiall pallace viz M^f Tallmans – the dutch amb^f the venetian amb^{rs} new & old the moscovites Envoy^s a very Grand feast.’

The French also prided themselves on their lavish entertainments. There was a particularly fine party held in January 1730 to celebrate the birth of a son to Louis XV, with the whole palace brightly illuminated for the occasion, which was something the Turks had not permitted in the past.⁴⁴ The celebrations lasted for three days and three nights, with enormous brightly coloured murals supported on wooden frameworks and lit up by lamps decorating the outside of the embassy. It seems that the artist Vanmour may have played some part in painting this scenery.

There were entertainments other than dinners and balls. In a letter to Newcastle, Kinnoull reports that the Venetian *bailo* ‘has prepared a Comedy and Opera to entertain the Greek Ladies of Pera during the Carneval’.⁴⁵ It was on his return from a Venetian ball that a band of Turks seized Louis Monier, Kinnoull’s one-time secretary; Kinnoull

described him as having been ‘cloathed in velvet and brocade’ for the occasion.⁴⁶

The Dalmatian port of Dubrovnik, at that time the independent city-republic of Ragusa, played an important role in trade between the Ottoman Empire and Europe, being conveniently placed in relation to both the Danube and Byzantium. Medley notes diplomatic contacts with Kinnoull:

8 January 1734

His Ex-y went over the Water to Stamboll – wth a Great Retinue – to vizit the two Ragoution ministers there.

10 January 1734

His Ex-y Entertaind at Diner y^c two Ministers from y^c Republic of Ragousia – who went away in y^c Evening.

22 February 1734

the Venetian amb^r & the Ragouzians vizited here towards Evening.

There were also more lowly staff from other embassies who dined with Lord Kinnoull from time to time, such as Calkoen’s secretary Rigo (whom Medley identifies as ‘Regoo’, or other such spelling), and also:

7 January 1735

a Great Snow fell Last night Count of Poland his secretary & prist M^r Coutery &c. dind wth his Ex-y in M-m^s hall.

9 October 1735

the new f Secretary M^r D Purier &c. dind wth his Ex-y.

It is in fact unclear whether Mr D. Purier was the new French secretary or whether he was an additional guest, for a Monsieur Purier had dined with Kinnoull on several previous occasions. A number of other mysterious people, probably French, including those whom Medley seemingly identifies as Ballmoe, Cuttroe, Ecarr or Ekarr, Trecocoe or Trecgoe, and La Bon put in an appearance at dinner occasionally, for instance on Saturday 7 December 1734 ‘Moun^r Cuttroe [?] D^r [?] Ballmoe [?] & other French Gn^r dind wth his Ex-y.’ Other occasional dining guests

who may or may not have been connected with embassies were ‘Sen^r Amilla’, ‘Mr Dominico’ and ‘Mr De flander’.

The merchants

The special relationship between the Levant Company and the embassy resulted in various anomalies, as we have seen. One of these was Kinnoull’s habit, probably of traditional origin, of inviting ‘the family’, in other words the English merchants, to dine with him on special anniversaries and also on some Sundays after church (which they were not always very good about attending). On Sunday 11 November 1733, for example, when there was ‘a verr keen frost – & Much Snow upon the Ground M^r Pain Read prayers – onely two Merchants & my self at Church – all the Merchants & M^r Pain – Except M^r Madewell & M^r Gening Dind wth My L^d.’ On Sunday 10 March 1734, ‘My L^d at Church M^r Pain preacht who wth all the Merchants dind wth his Ex-y – a very Good Hansome Entertainment’; then on Sunday 14 April ‘His Ex-y at Church the 2 Sw-s Gentⁿ & many of the Merchants – who all Dind wth My L^d – Easter Sunday – My L^d Heard prayers afternoon’ and on Sunday 16 June 1734, ‘M^r Pain Read prayers in the Great hall – all y^c merchants there But Mr Barker – they all & Mr Barker dind wth his Ex-y.’

On occasions they also dined at his table in his absence. One such occasion was on 24 November 1734 when ‘M^r Pain Give us a Sermon – he & all the Merchants dind at my Lords table – but His Ex-y not there being gon on Board the venetian Ship to take Leave of the biloo.’ Thus, we may assume that the merchants regularly sat at table with Lord Kinnoull; at the same time, some of them were evidently also among Samuel Medley’s social acquaintances, as we have seen above – a situation that would have been improbable in England.

Apart from those whom Medley seems to count among his friends – Barker, Maydwell, Hanger, Pemberton, Jennings and ‘young Mr Lyle’ (actually ‘Lisle’) – the only other merchants that we know, from the diary, were invited to dine on Sundays were James Jennings (whom Medley sometimes identifies as ‘Mr Genings’), ‘Mr Lyle Snr’, ‘Mr Lee’ (who joined the Lisle firm) and ‘Mr Levit’. The Lisle family was well represented at times. For example, on Wednesday 19 December 1733, ‘His Excellency Entertaind Captin Lyle & his Brother now Come from Eng-d M^r Lyle y^c Merchant & other Gen^t at diner – My L^d vizited Some of y^c Pallaces Evening.’ In addition to the captain, there appear to be three

other Lisle brothers, two of whom were merchants and the other the MP for Southampton.

Other residents

Attending church and listening to Mr Payne's sermons with him, Samuel Medley notes the presence of various people, perhaps likely to be local residents, including the Misses Savage. He mentions the death of their mother in Constantinople in 1735,⁴⁷ but we are not told who they were or why they were there. A certain William Savage, who may or may not have been connected with them, had come out on the *Torrington* with Kinnoull.⁴⁸

Others at church were a Mr Abbott and a Mr Philips; the latter may perhaps have been the Mr Phips who, along with his spouse and brother, dined with Kinnoull on 18 April 1734.

We also find Mr Higgs who, along with his brother, dined with Kinnoull, but who also dined at Mr Humpheries' in the company of Medley. Other guests probably resident locally (and spelt variously) are Mr Laister and family of three sons, Colonel Moriagy, Mr Stanton the Englishman, Mr Manny, Mr Moxson, Mr Mossco, Mr Alexander, Mr Death (variously spelt) and Dr Dess who sailed home to England with Captain Lisle on 11 March 1734.

There was one occasion⁴⁹ when 'D^r Thodosos Spouse' came to call on Kinnoull. Dr Theodose seems to have been a local medical doctor and Lord Kinnoull may well have consulted him professionally. Certainly Samuel Medley did consult him on 14 October 1735 when 'I took phisick from D^r Theodose.'

Of particular interest, among the residents listed above, is Baron Zy, whom Medley mentions on nine occasions, dining and going riding with Kinnoull, in the company of Stadnicki, the Swedes, the Venetian Dandilo, and/or various Frenchmen, among others. For instance, on Tuesday 16 April 1734, 'in the night & in y^e morning – Baron Sy Colonel Moragy M^r allexander M^r Purrier & Mon^r Trecoo & the Dutch Secretary dind wth His Ex-y – & Suppt allsoe – the Polland Envoy at Supp^r. Baron Zy was a Hungarian with whom de Saussure had stayed, out at Rodosto, 100 miles (or two days' post) from Constantinople, in 1733.⁵⁰ Turkey had ceded Hungary to Austria in 1698 and Prince Francis Rakoczi, having tried and failed to raise Hungary against the Empire, had fled to Turkey, where he lived at Rodosto. He was a sworn enemy of the Hapsburgs and in touch with Bonneval. Rakoczi's

secretary, Bohn, was in the pay of Thalmann who was therefore well informed.

Medley mentions Rakoczi but once, on Monday 31 March 1735, when he says ‘about 3 or 4 days agoe died Princ Ragottcy – at Rodisto.’ The Turks had been ambitious to use Rakoczi and the French had encouraged them in this;⁵¹ after his death, his son arrived in the country from Venice and Kinnoull wrote to Newcastle that he had heard a rumour that the Porte would give him ‘his Father’s Pension of 24000 Dollars of this country or £3500 sterling a year and to keep alive still that pretension against the Emperor’.⁵² Kinnoull challenged the Porte over this and was assured that they would treat him simply as a private Hungarian nobleman under the Grand Signor’s protection and might give him a small yearly pension to cover subsistence only.⁵³ The Porte did use him in the end, in 1737–39 when they recovered Hungary.

The visitors

Apart from Lady Gerard of Bromley, whose visit is noted in *European women in Constantinople in the early eighteenth century* in Chapter 2, we only know of one ‘special’ visitor during Kinnoull’s period in office and he came before Samuel Medley started keeping his diary. This far from ideal guest was the Earl of Radnor who arrived, early in 1731, with two companions. Kinnoull said that he had found him a good house in which to live but that he saw no one and ‘lyes abed all day and sits up most of the night’. He had been abroad for three years already.⁵⁴ A month later, Kinnoull reported that Radnor was leaving; he had dined with Kinnoull from time to time, for instance for the celebration of the Prince of Wales’s birthday, and in company with other ambassadors, but had refused to visit them.⁵⁵

However, Kinnoull acted as host to the captains of English ships in harbour, as well as to other officers on those ships and to the occasional person they either brought or who was leaving with them.

There was Captain Lisle, bringing his brother (see *Messrs Matth, Humpheris, Lynwood and Wallace* in this chapter), who came into harbour on 16 December 1733 and ‘Sayld away’ on 27 December 1733; he was back again in March, on the way home, and (on 15 March 1734) ‘Set Sayle for England at night & took in Mr Chezwell & Dr Dess – along wth him’. Mr Chezwell (Richard Chiswell)⁵⁶ was a Levant Company merchant of note who does not feature in the diary other than on this date. Medley notes four occasions in December 1733 when

the captain dined with Lord Kinnoull, including Christmas Day. Dr Dess was probably Dr Dease who may have been the Levant Company doctor before Dr Smith, although the two overlapped for a substantial period. Dr Dease was a recipient (with the chaplain Mr Payne) of interest from Levant Company loans to merchants in 1732.⁵⁷

Captain Petrie, who had been at the centre of ‘the Petrie affair’ (see *The Petrie affair* in Chapter 3) in 1732, had set out from London, in the *William*,⁵⁸ reaching Falmouth on 8 November 1733 with a load of tin for Smyrna and Constantinople.⁵⁹ Medley hears that he was going to Smyrna on 27 January 1734 and notes his arrival six days later on 2 February; three days later Medley and Dr Smith were entertained on board. Petrie was by then a long-term acquaintance of Kinnoull’s and dined with him on nine occasions that February (once at the house of the merchant Mr Hanger), and once specifically ‘Supt wth M-m’ (18 February 1734). Medley notes that he sailed on 23 February 1734, and ‘Came to Smyrna’ on 1 March. But it was not only the captain who dined with Kinnoull:

Tuesday 19 February 1734

M^r Phill – the first mate of the ship dind wth my L^d in the Low hall.

22 February 1734

His Ex-y dind in the Low Hall – the Captin & M^r Suckling Came from on Board – (the wind not yet being good) and dind wth My L^d.

In October/November there was a Captain Hack who dined with Kinnoull on three occasions, but we know nothing more about him, and there was a visit in December from an unidentified captain, doubtless in some distress, whom Kinnoull sought to comfort as best he could:

9 December 1734

The English Capⁿ came to My L^d – he who had Lost his Ship by y^e neopollitans His Ex-y Dind at Even & we had a Noble Hanch of wilde boor to diner.

The following year, Medley notes that Captain Bolton’s ship was in dock from 6 February to 19 March (and again for three or four days in August 1736), and that he was also a dinner guest of Kinnoull. His was the ship on which, regrettably, Samuel Medley and Mr Brown ‘got too much drink’

on Shrove Tuesday (11 February 1735) (see *Messrs Matth, Humpheries, Lynwood and Wallace* in this chapter).

Captain Hamshire, with 11 diary entries in January, February and March 1735, brought a guest as well as a cargo:

18 February 1735

the Supercargo Belonging Capⁿ Hamshires ship came here.

27 February 1735

the consull yⁱ came wth Captin Hamshire Supp^t wth his Ex-y.

However, for some unknown reason, Captain Hamshire himself is not recorded as calling on, let alone dining with, Kinnoull. Instead, he went walking with Medley and friends, ‘to the auction at the french pallace’ (7 January 1735), ‘to the English Buriing ground – & ... to M^r Hillars after wth Mr Sesan &c.’ (12 January 1735), ‘to Dollmabatch to topena and Galleta’ (14 January 1735), ‘to Stambol’ (16 January 1735), ‘to Constantinople: to the three pillars – to the Seraglio gate and Round that part of the City’ (21 January 1735), ‘to galleta’ (22 January 1735), ‘to q^r Stradda’ (3 February 1735) and ‘to the funerall of old M^r Savage after diner’ (10 February 1735).

The captain’s apparent avoidance of Kinnoull was particularly curious in that Kinnoull had authorized the Levant Company to pay him 200 dollars (£30) compensation, and had spent time and energy at the end of the previous year corresponding with Robinson in Vienna, in connection with his ship, the *Mary Gally*, having been taken by an Imperial cruiser near Cerigo (an Ionian island south of Morea). The vice-consul in Morea had also paid the captain 160 dollars (£23) ‘w^{ch} money is to be reimbursed from the satisfaction that may be received at Vienna by Mr Robertson [presumably Robinson] to whom the s^d Captⁿ Hamshire has been sent by his Excellency’. Perhaps Hamshire, as a seaman, was not keen to have been given the task of going to Vienna to make his case. The ship was owned by Messrs Brown & Butler of Cadiz, from whom Hamshire’s 200 dollars (£30) compensation were to be recovered. Harrington was also involved in the matter, having received a petition from the London insurers of the ship.⁶⁰

At the end of April two ships arrived and there was a good ‘church parade’:

26 April 1735

the two English Shipp^s arived this morning viz Capⁿ Timms & Capⁿ Merchant allsoe M^r Lee a new merchant to M^r Lyles who wth M^r Lee y^e new marchant vizited my Lord.

Sunday 27 April 1735

His Ex-y at Church – M^r Pain preacht – the merchants – Capptins & officers & Saylor & c. – n^o 45 – at church – the merchants & Capp^{ns} & officers dind wth My Lord.

1 May 1735

I went down In the morning – to the Seale at Galleta – to Se Capptin Timms & Capptin Merchant & My acquaintance in the two Shipp^s – & Returnd by a 11: to diner.

‘Capⁿ Merchant’ was in fact Captain Willoughby Marchant and his ship was the *Thames*.⁶¹ Medley managed to visit his friends on board again but the ship had a quick turn-around because on 15 May 1735 ‘captin Marchant Sayld in the Evening for Sallonica’. There was more time for Medley to revisit the *Asia*, Captain Timms’s ship, and for the captain to dine with Lord Kinnoull and to visit some of the city’s delights:

23 May 1735

I walked to Galleta – & met wth M^r Timms & the D^r & Returnd wth them to the quate^r Stad: & from there wth them to the dervices – & so home before diner – the Bottles viz 12 came from y^e ship.

26 June 1735

Capⁿ Timms sayld away this Evening.

Meanwhile, two other ships arrived. Captain Hogg ‘came to wait on my Lord’ on the 10th and Captain Long ‘Came In to harrbour’ on the 12th. There is no note of the former dining with Kinnoull, but he dutifully called on him before departing:

5 June 1735

Capⁿ Hogg tooke Leave for Sailing to candia.

Captain Long stayed until at least 15 June, dined with Kinnoull on several occasions and attended church.

Captain Petrie was back again between 19 June and 27 August 1735, now with another ship, the *Tigress*. Medley visited the ship – for pleasure, but also for a sad duty because, on 1 July 1735, it was ‘Exceeding Hott [and] I went wth many of our Servants to y^c funeral of the D^r of the tigress.’ Captain Petrie dined with the ambassador on several occasions, and visits to the ship continued:

Sunday 6 July 1735

His Ex-y & all the Merchants at Church – & the Capⁿ Petrie & Ships Company all dind wth my L^d Excep Mr Lyle Ser.

Wednesday 16 July 1735

I went to Capⁿ Petrees Ship wth present from my L^d of a Boor & 2 fine porkes I dind after wth M^r Humferies – the captⁿ & M^r Tobin M^r Hipps &c. Suppt wth His Ex-y.

Saturday 19 July 1735

after My L^d had Dind I went wth M^r Clark to Capⁿ petrees Ship the tygress – at Besictach – to an auction there – & Stayd wth him on Bord all night M^r Phill & M^r Dorrell Entertaind us kindly.

Mr Phill and Mr Dorrell evidently belonged to the *Tigress* and were perhaps officers. Medley notes the presence of Mr Tobin, presumably a visitor, on six occasions in July; he dined with Kinnoull and departed on the French ship seen above. The *Tigress* left the following day for Joppa, and from there for England, with Mrs Sandys on board, homeward bound (see ‘*Madam*’ and *Mrs Sandys* in this chapter).

Captain Osborne brought the *Portland*, a man-of-war, into harbour on 27 January 1736; this was the ship that Newcastle hoped, albeit in vain, would remove Kinnoull and his household to England. A Mr Thompson, perhaps one of the officers, accompanied Medley on board; another officer may have been the Mr Fanshaw of the following entry on Tuesday 24 February: ‘I went wth M^r Jones to se the dervisces worship Captin ozburn & M^r fanshaw ther also.’ Medley also notes (on 8 February 1736) that ‘M^r Linn Chaplin to the ship preach^d the two ambasadors [namely Kinnoull and Fawkener] at Church my L^d dind wth the new ambasadour.’

There is just one mention of a ‘Capⁿ Scot’, whose ship Medley visited in June, and then, in October, a note that ‘the french Capⁿ Remotee dind here’ (7 October 1736); perhaps he was the captain of another of the ships on which Kinnoull was not ready to go home.

Newsworthy events and rumours

We have given, in Chapters 3 and 4, various quotations from Medley’s diary illustrating his awareness of events associated with the Persian war and the war of Polish Succession. He also notes a variety of more local news, which we give without comment for its variety and charm:

Opposite 25 October 1733

We ar now Inform’d – that Gallio a man that tooke shellter here to keep him from the just punishment – due for his Treasonable designs and accion In England In Flanders & Eles wheare Dyed about 8 days agoe at Constantinople – tis Reported he was verry Enthusiasticall (or affected to apear so to the turks)

Friday 11 January 1734

A Snowy Raney – unpleasant Season – a Confirmation Came this morning of the Tragical news – that the Roos [that is, *Rose*] an English Ship was Cast away near the Castles – & very few persons Saved.⁶²

Opposite 25 February 1734

This morning 2 persons was handg on y^e yard arm of one of the Gallies for designing yesterday to poyson y^e captin Bashaw (or Cheife admirall) wth a dish of coffee.

9 March 1734

Wee hear there has ben many Executions at Stamboll viz some hundereds: for 2 or 3 days past.

Opposite 28 January 1735

News Came (about this time) of a Dutch pirat wth German Coullers being taken by 2 french Ships In Sight of the Islands – and the Country people Se the Engagement – the truth of wth Story a little time will discover...

9–10 June 1735

Monday the Gates of y^e Pallace Shutt up on acc^t of the pest – Breaking out – news from Bellgrade villa – of a Quarrell twixt M^r maner & M^r deeach Servant – & on Saturday Last 12 person drown in sight of Great Nor of people – & 7 Saved. 7 people Hang'd nere y^e gardens for Ludeness 10 ... about 4 days agoe 7 men & women was hanged for keeping lude House near y^e gardens here.

18 August 1735

The Parrot got out of the Cage so y^t they dind under the tree & got him again.

27 February 1736

This day one of the Dutch vallets de Chambers was Executed – for killing a Jenesary.

PERSONAL MATTERS

Correspondents

Nowhere in Samuel Medley's diary is there any indication of correspondence with members of his family. He does, however, mention a few people in England to whom he writes:

6 February 1734

Recd a letter from m Gribling & a present from him.

17 February 1734

I went to M^r Genings (after diner) [he is referring to Jennings the merchant] & give him my Letter to M^r Gribling.

22 September 1734

I Sent a letter to M^r Roundell in Mr Pain^s.

6 November 1734

I Sent a letter to Mr Roundell & one Enclosd to my friends at notingham In M^r Madewells paquett.

5 April 1735

I Rec^d a line or 2 from M^r griblin.

3 May 1735

I put 2 letter into my L^{ds} paquet for England one for M^r Roundell & one for M^r Griblin.

Unfortunately we have no information on these correspondents.

Health problems

We have seen that Samuel Medley enjoyed excursions on foot from Pera and he certainly did his best to keep himself fit (and/or to avoid boredom) by frequent walks when he was at Belgrade village; usually a mile or two, sometimes more:

Tuesday 18 June 1734

I walked (after Diner) wth M^r Clark M^r Sesan &c. to Batchaque 3 long miles.

Friday 9 August 1734

The Count Dind wth my Lord – I walked to y^e fountain morning – and wth Billy Clarke beyond y^e Second Keeosk In all to day about 4 miles.

He was also well capable of a good ride:

4 May 1734

I was about 9 hours on hors Back – but very well Blessed be my god.

5 September 1734

I Rid out toward^s Burgos In y^e Evening wth W^m Clark Jn^r about 4 miles – & Back to Send the horses to pera wth y^e arrabas.

He never complains of ailments like colds or influenza, and only once (16 September 1735) of a stomach problem: ‘Tuesday I was very bad – by a great purging this morning – & a Reaching to vomiting – Blessed be god I am much better.’ Most of the time, despite his age (he had his seventieth birthday a month before leaving Constantinople in May 1737), his only health complaint seems to have been periodic attacks of gout, about which he has some nice turns of phrase:

20 December 1733

I have had this two Days – a Smatch of the Gout in my foot.

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

Friday 21 December 1733

The Gout Seized me Last Night verry violently in my foot – but a little Easier this morning BB m GG. ... I kept my Chambr all day – very Lame.

22 December 1733

Much pain In my foot In Bed this Morning – & yet very Lame – & Continued all day.

Sunday 23 December 1733

Something better in my foot BBG.

24 December 1733

Yet Lame but In hopes tis going off – Remov'd to my other foot in the night.

The problem continued to the end of the month:

Sunday 30 December 1733

A Great Snow on y^e Ground Something Better In my foot BBmGG ... a very Snowy wett day – I kept my Chamb^r all day.

What with the gout and the weather:

14 January 1734

I walked to M^r Shermetts – to M^r Robisons & home in the Morning being the first walk I have had this 20 days.

Apart from a brief spell in February, he then was apparently gout free until July, when the problem returned:

Monday 1 July 1734

I walked to the Spring in y^e morning – but Lame in my ankle the Gout comeing on I walked after wth M^r Clark – to the dutch ambas^{er} field but wors & wors in my ankle – at Even it seizd me – very Bad – & I went to bed.

2 July 1734

I was very Lame – In the Gout all day.

3 July 1734

yet very Lame – tho I walked to y^c Bouling green wth pain.

4 July 1734

I was very Lame all this day.

Friday 5 July 1734

Something better In my foot BBmGG.

Medley did some research on the matter in January 1735 when he consulted Dr T. Dover's book: *The ancient physician's legacy to his country. Being what he has collected himself in forty-nine years' practice ...*, perhaps using the fourth edition, London, 1733, in which, on page 11 he would have found opposite the entry for 21 January 1735 'a Remedy for Gouty persons by D^r Dover'. Here, the doctor describes how 'Mynsycht's Elixir of vitriol taken often In Large Quantities, most Certainly destroys Gouty Matter, yet for Some time it may Cause pain; But taken In Its due Latitude, If water Will Quench fire, it must In the End have its Desired Effect.' Whether or not Mynsycht's Elixir was available to him we do not know. There was another, alternative suggestion from Dr Dover, which Sam evidently rejected:

Take Opium one Ounce, Salt-petre and Tartar vitriolated, each four Ounces, Ipcacuana one Ounce, liquorish one Ounce. Put the Salt-petre and Tartar into a red-hot Mortar, stirring them with a Spoon till they have done flaming – Then powder them very fine, after that slice in your Opium; grind these to a Powder, and then mix the other Powders with these. Dose from forty to sixty or seventy Grains in a Glass of White-Wine Posset, going to bed – covering up warm and drinking a Quart or three Pints of the Posset – Drink while sweating. In two or three Hours at farthest, the Patient will be perfectly free from Pain.

While he was about it, Medley noted suggestions for curing asthma and diabetes,⁶³ though we have no indication that he suffered from either of these. Opposite his entry for 16 January 1735 he has written down:

Remedy for y^e diabetes by D^r Dover

Drink a quarter of a pint of Allom posset drink – first and Last,

Made as Strong as y^e Stomach will bear it – 35 years Experience & this Never faild.

For the asthma

Take castor one dram, salt of Steel Half a dram – made into very smale pills – wth Extract of Rue: – these you may take Every hour till the convulsion is abated. Drink 3 spoonfulls of y^e following Julep after Each dose take of Black Cherry, & penny Royal water Each an ounce, of Rue & Compound Briony waters, Each 4 ounces, wth a Smale quantity of Sugar made into a Julep – or a toad dried & powdered made Into pills & taken as above, Is a most Excellent Remedy – & tho Some wiseacers Say a toad is poisonous animal – it is poor Innocent & harmless Creature – & a Blessin Bestowd on Mankind

It should be said that Dr Dover did not meet with universal approval; indeed, in 1733 in London, a book was published by one, D. Turner, entitled: *The ancient physician's* [namely T. Dover's] *legacy impartially survey'd; and his practice prov'd repugnant*. The previous year, Medley had made a note opposite the 11 February 1734 entry indicating some interest in research into medical matters: 'Lexicon physico Medicum by D^r Quincy 1722.' Quincy's work was 'a new medicinal dictionary; explaining the difficult terms usd in the several branches of the profession'.⁶⁴ Whether or not Sam attempted to use the cure he had copied out from Dr Dover's book, in the following year, he suffered two attacks – in May and November:

24 May 1735

The Gout Came into my toe Last night & has ben very bad all this day.

25 May 1735

Very full of Pain Last night – and gon very Lame yet – I could not goe to Church – [today] Whitson Sunday – and very bad all day.

Monday 26 May 1735

wors & worss in my foot this moring & bad all day

27 May 1735

the Gout came allso this morning wn In Bed to my ancle & kee – Pain all day – my L^d & M-m Suppt at y^c Sweeds Pallace.

31 May 1735

Lame yet in my feet.

25 November 1735

A violent fit of y^c Gout tooke me this morning & held bad all day.

28 November 1735

Much Better B B my good god – Gott up – this morning.

Saturday 29 November 1735

My Lameness goeing off fast I hope – wast not out all day.

He seems not to have come across the writings of Sir Richard Blackmore MD, royal physician to King Willam III (until he read Pomfret's poem *Reason* in February 1736 – see *Messrs Matth, Humpheries, Lynwood and Wallace* in this chapter) otherwise he might have found his way to Blackmore's *Discourses in the Gout A Rheumatism and the King's Evil ...* (London, 1726): in 150 pages, the author explains with great thoroughness why he is not a believer in simple remedies but comes to the conclusion that 'opiate remedies are necessarily demanded when the pains are very acute and are the patient's chief Anchor that enables him to ride out the Gouty storm with safety'. He suggests, for instance, a combination of 'Flowers of Sulphur, Myrrh, Saffron, Extractum Thebaicum, Liquid Laudanum, Syrop of White Poppys' with extra laudanum if needed.

Medley suffered a fall on 11 February 1736, but apparently with no long-term ill-effects: 'I got a great fall and hurt my face the same day Last year I had the like misfortune – v 11 of Last february.' At the end of April, he was bitten by a dog (but forgot to tell us at the time) and, unpleasant though the results were, he was perhaps lucky they were not worse:

5 May 1736

Went not out to day – being Lame by the bite of a dog – Last Thursday.

6 May 1736

I went not out of y^e gate being very Lame.

8 May 1736

Exceeding worse In my Legg.

10 May 1736

much Wors. 2 holes more broke out.

Tuesday 11 May 1736

very bad yet – & the gout came also.

12 May 1736

the Gout yet wth me besides my wound.

He continued to be troubled into June:

2 June 1736

The gout got into my heile.

16 June 1736

Something bettr in my ancle b.b.m.g.g.

Thursday 17 June 1736

Better in my foot Bbmgg

Then in August, his enemy attacked on a different front:

4 August 1736

this night the Gout came into my hand.

9th & 10th & 11th & 12th & 13th much pain in my hand.

19 August 1736

Lame in my finger Still took phisick to day.

31 August 1736

yet Lame in my finger.

2 September 1736

Still Continue bad in my hand.

He was not prepared to say that he was ‘much better bbbgg’ until 8 September.

Samuel Medley’s reading matter

On many pages of the diary, opposite his entries, Samuel Medley made notes on and transcribed quotations from literature he was reading; these can be found in full on the website www.leginipress.co.uk, together with extensive notes. They reveal an ambitious literary appetite surely unusual in a butler. Medley is likely to have had access to two libraries – that of the Levant Company and that of Lord Kinnoull, who clearly cared greatly for his library so that, when it came to selling up to pay off debts and raise money for the homeward journey, he decided that he could not face putting his books on the market.⁶⁵ Medley makes no mention of borrowing books from either library; indeed, his only reference to the embassy library is on Friday 3 October 1735, when he says ‘I was in y^e Library & other Rooms wth Dressing y^e Chimney pieces.’ We do not know how representative either library was of the literary range of the period but, as will be seen, Medley was evidently able to find a variety of authors, published in the second half of the seventeenth, and the first twenty years of the eighteenth centuries, on matters of particular interest to him.

This was a period of experimentation in literature – prose, poetry and drama – and also a time of development of important social and political theory. ‘The literature created between the years of Republican ferment in the 1650s and the coalescence of a Georgian state in the early eighteenth century reflects the instability and partisanship of rebellious and factious times.’⁶⁶ On the one hand, there was a trend towards greater political stability and self-confidence; on the other, there were divisions, often bitter and sometimes violent, over religious, social and political issues. It was a period of keen debate in philosophy and religion – Protestant versus Catholic (the persecution of the Huguenots was at its height in the middle of the period); church establishment versus dissenter; faith and biblical interpretations versus scientific thought; the reasonableness or otherwise of religious belief.⁶⁷

Many labels have been attached to the period – the neoclassical age; the age of scepticism; the Augustan age; the age of prose; the age of

reason; the era of enlightenment – all of these represent faces of the period; none of them fully represents it.

While Samuel Medley's main interests were in practical religion and morality, the selections he made showed that he was particularly attracted to intellectual debate, to the place of science in relation to Christian belief, and to medical publications; they also show that he had a love for poetry. He may well have taken advice on his reading, particularly perhaps from the Reverend Thomas Payne, the Levant Company chaplain, but his choices of what to transcribe into his diary seem essentially personal.

On the whole, he has transcribed carefully and accurately, only allowing himself occasional abbreviations like 'y' for 'the'; 'y' for 'that'; or '&' for 'and'. His use of capital letters was a bit random, however, as was his insertion of commas and dashes. Since, in many cases, we cannot identify the exact edition, or sometimes even the publication, from which he has quoted, we have reproduced the quoted passages (on the web site and, where relevant, here) as he has written them, only making minor alterations where it seemed essential.

There remains a question mark over the fact that nearly all the quotations are firmly crossed through in the diary with a vertical line. A possible explanation is suggested by a passage in the heavily rose-tinted section written about him by his great-grandson, Samuel Medley (1769–1857) at the beginning of a biography of the latter's father (the butler's grandson), the Reverend Samuel Medley (1738–99):

Late in life he held a respectable situation in the suite of the earl of Kinnoul, in his embassy from the British court to Constantinople. Into this earl's service he entered, as appears from his diary, on the 16th day of October, 1729; and in this situation he continued upwards of seven years, during which time he accurately recorded every remarkable circumstance, natural, moral, political, or religious, which came under his notice, never suffering any useful hint to escape. His station in life gave him the fullest opportunity of gratifying this his favourite propensity; and here he collected the materials of a manuscript, which he has entitled the *Miscellaneous Observations of Samuel Medley*. The remarks we have mentioned above consist, in general, of short and striking sentences, interesting anecdotes, proverbial sayings, and pious observations; many of them are by himself, some from the writings of ingenious men of

former ages, and others from his contemporaries. Though the number of these selections is very considerable, there does not appear the least trace of a sour, contracted, or illiberal spirit among them.

The papers alluded to consist of three manuscripts; viz. a Diary, kept while in Turkey; his *Miscellaneous Observations*; and thirdly, his more private experience as a Christian. The last was begun when he must have been seventy years of age.

The account then continues, giving accurate quotations from the diary, followed by quotations from *Miscellaneous Observations*, which include some of those found on the opposite pages of the diary but also some others not found there.

Thus, it seems likely that, after his return from Constantinople, by which time he was indeed 70, Medley transcribed most or all of the quotations he had noted in his diary, from the diary into another book, which he entitled *Miscellaneous Observations*, crossing them through in the diary as he did so. He would have completed the *Miscellaneous Observations*, now presumed lost, with further supplementary material and, perhaps, more of his own ideas and observations.

The writing of prose and the composition of poetry were then both regarded as crafts, each worthy of respect in its own rights and Medley seemed primarily interested in what the authors were writing rather than in assessing merit or distinguishing between forms of communication. Where a passage appears opposite a particular page of diary entries, it does not follow that he wrote it there and then – indeed, from 6 September 1735 he uses both sides of the page for the diary at times, and sometimes has several consecutive pages of quotations. However, there is some logic about the order in which most of the quotations appear in the diary (in other words the order seems, to some extent, to represent the order of reading).

Here, then, is a summary of the passages quoted (apart from the medical ones that appear in *Health problems* in Chapter 5), in the order in which they appear.

In mid-December 1733 (probably), Medley read a sermon by the Reverend J. Tillotson (1630–94), Archbishop of Canterbury under William and Mary, and quoted a passage that one feels will have satisfactorily reinforced his strong personal anti-papist inclinations:

If it seem Good to us, to put our necks once more under that yoke, w^{ch} our fathers were not able to bear: ... If to pray without understanding, & to obey without Reason, & to believe against Sense, If ignorance, and Implicit faith, and an Inquisition, be in good Earnest Such Charming and desirable things: then welcome popery; – w^{ch} wherever thou Comest, dost Infallibly Bring all these wonderfull priviledges & Blessings along wth these.

It may not be a coincidence that in a collection of Levant Company orders and letters dated 1717 we find that the General Court agreed to spend £30 on more books for the Constantinople library and the list of added volumes (dated 1710) included a Tillotson work that Medley quoted.⁶⁸

Around Christmas Eve, he transcribed a passage from a sermon given in 1692 by Dr Richard Bentley (1662–1742), Bishop of Worcester, on ‘A confutation of atheism from the Structure and Origin of Human Bodies’, arguing that only by God could such wonders have been created.

By contrast, in New Year 1734, however, Medley quoted from two love poems, the first by Sir Charles Sedley Bt (c.1639–1701), the second by Sir George Etherege (1634–91/2), probably from an anthology of 1701 that, presumably, came from Lord Kinnoull’s library; almost certainly, the Reverend Thomas Payne would not have recommended them because these two poets were equally known for their amorality and outrageous behaviour. We give the rather charming Etherege passage in full:

It is not, Celia, in our Power
 To say how long our love will last
 It may be we within this hour
 May Lose those joys we now do tast
 The Blessed, that Immortal be
 From Change in Love are only free

Then Since we mortal lovers are
 Ask not how long our love will Last;
 But while it dos, let us take Care
 Each minute be wth Pleasure past:
 Were it not Madness to deny
 To live, because w’are sure to die

Corresponding in position in the diary to mid-January 1734, there are two quotations from a poem by George Granville, Viscount Lansdowne (1666–1735), politician and writer, almost certainly found in the same anthology as those above. The second passage given below encapsulates well Medley’s own philosophy, one feels:

Happy the Man; of Mortals Happiest he
 Whose quiet mind from vain desiers is free
 Whome neither Hopes deceive; nor fears torment
 But lives at peace within himself content
 In thought or act, accountable to none
 But to himself and to great god alone.

At the beginning of February, developing this philosophical theme, Medley found a delightful poem by the outstanding poet and satirist of the English Augustan period, Alexander Pope (1688–1744). The simple piece Medley chose is known as the *Ode on Solitude*, which Pope claimed⁶⁹ to have ‘written when I was not twelve years old’:

Happy the man, whose wish & care
 A few paternal Acres Bound,
 Content to breath his native air
 In his own Ground
 Whose heards wth milk, whose fields wth bread
 Whose flocks supply him with attire
 Whose trees In sumer yield him Shade
 In winter, fire
 Blest, who can unconcerndly finde
 Hours, days & years; slide soft away
 In health of Body, Peace of mind
 Quiet by day
 Sound Sleep by night; Study & Ease,
 Togather mixt; sweet Recreation
 & Innocence w^{ch} most does please
 With Meditation
 Thus let me live unseen, unknown
 Thus unlamented let me die
 Steal from the world, & not a stone
 Tell where I lie

Patrotism is the theme of Medley's next quotation, in March, from half way through the long and gory poem *Campaign* by Joseph Addison (1672–1739), essayist, poet and statesman, which celebrated the Duke of Marlborough's victory at Blenheim in 1704.

Later in the month, Medley had evidently been reading the periodical *The Guardian*, to which Addison among others contributed, published in 1713 and subsequently available in book form. He selected from an anonymous piece of *Sacred Poesie*, apparently concerned with the Last Day, choosing suitably worthy passages, the second of which ends:

Hear & assist a feeble mortals Lays
tis your Eternal King I Strive to praise

In mid-April, we find him showing interest in *Observations upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands* by Sir William Temple, Bt (1628–99), author and diplomat, who (among other appointments) was ambassador at The Hague in 1668–69. Perhaps Medley's experience of the Dutch ambassador, Calkoen, has made him curious about the Netherlands, which Sir William described for him succinctly in the quoted passage as follows:

Holland is a Country, where the Earth is better yn the air – & profit more in Request yn Honour; where there is more Sence than wit; more good nature than good humer, & more wealth than pleasure: Where a man wod Chuse Rather to travel then to live; Shall finde more things to observe than desire & more persons to Esteem than to Love

At the end of April, he was, surely, in deep water with 'A Collection of Some Expreions & Remarques of the Reverd Mr Squires In his preface – In answer to the Booke Calld y^e Independent whig Speaking of England the Contitution the Relegion polittics & pashons & follys of Eng-h-n'. In 1723 Francis Squire published this in his *Answer* to papers published in a weekly periodical, *The Independent Whig*, which reminded readers of the principles of the Reformation, stressing that 'you cannot take as much of popery as you please'.

One can see that the latter line would have appealed to Samuel Medley and it would seem fair to guess that he had tackled *The Independent Whig* himself before embarking on Squire's *Answer*. Medley transcribed five

quite extensive passages, none of them easy to follow, covering, respectively:

- the foundations ‘on which the happiness of this nation Intirely Depends’;
- the thought that it is a ‘pitty y^t Prosperity Should allways make men wanton’;
- the author’s concern for those who ‘Give up themselves to the Management of Papists & Jacobites or who from a Just dread of Priest Craft, & Spiritual tyranny, have plung’d themselves Into Irriligion & prophaneness’;
- the author’s impatience with those who ‘commit the Custody of their Consciences to such, as have not Religion Enough to make them trustworthy for forty Shillings’;
- the author’s condemnation of those who ‘have prostituted their Honour & their liberty to men who do good but by accident, & to whome Every thing is lawfull; ...who have no settled principls of their own actions’.

Medley would have often been in agreement with Squires, though perhaps without his vehemence, and must have puzzled over which side he was on. One could suppose that he may perhaps have been struggling with the work at the behest of either the chaplain or Lord Kinnoull. However, he was not simply copying blindly because, by July, he had had time to reflect further on what he had read and permitted himself a rare venture into literary criticism:

a man that flaters you In one part of his Booke – & Glareingly Jears
& Reflects on you – In another – the Revernd M^r Squires –
Compares to a Story – of a Certain warm Gent^e that happened to
be a little in a passion wth his wife – & after he had swore a
hundered times – that all the whole sex were wh-res – yet (says he)
I Love an honest woman as well as any man In the world –

Meanwhile, in mid-May, he returned to Sir William Temple, noting and understandably interested in the remarkable truth that, in Holland, ‘no man can here complain of pressure in his conscience, of being forced to any publick profession of his private faith’.

About this time Medley went to Belgrade village, where he stayed till

October, and it is interesting to consider whether he took with him a number of books he had borrowed. There was, of course, regular ‘traffic’ between Belgrade and Pera but direct access for him to either of the libraries would have been impossible.

In June Medley copied out a rather contrived poem entitled ‘A Description of Fortune’ published in a collection of works attributed to George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham (1628–87), but quite probably not in fact by him.

In August Medley gave two brief quotations from unknown sources, both doubtless illustrative of his own beliefs: ‘Prosperity has ben the Ruin of many This is Indeed the Nature of things; adversity is the best gaurd against pride & wantonness; & nothing is more certain, than that wealth & power are never misused before they are obtaind’ and ‘Virtus est vitium fugere, Et Sapientia prima Stultitia carnisse – vertue begins in the forsaking of vice; & the first part of wisdome – Is not to be a fool.’ It is interesting that he is happy to quote a Latin tag (Horace, in fact) and one wonders to what extent Latin was a part of his education.

Later that month – August 1734 – there is a moralizing snippet from *The Guardian* and then a return visit to Archbishop Tillotson for his view of the futility of the pursuit of happiness: ‘We pursue the Happiness of this World Just as little Childeren Chase birds, When we think we are Come very near it – and have it almost in our hands it flies further from us than it was at first.’

September sees him reading ‘a prayer of Henry 4th of france – Just before a Battle – In w^{ch} he obtaind an Entire victory’ – finding in this the absolute trust in God’s providence to which he too subscribes.

In October he concentrated on the achievement of peace of mind through faith and the rejection of atheism, reading and quoting from Archbishop Tillotson again, from the mathematician and philosopher Dr John Clarke (c.1680–1759), and from the liberally inclined man of letters and mystical theologian François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénélon (1651–1715), Archbishop of Cambrai, whose name he may first have encountered in the pages of *The Guardian*.

In November, when Medley was back in Pera, he again picked up Sir William Temple, whom Bishop Burnet had accused of atheism and whose views on faith, which Medley quoted, are certainly not in line with his previous recent reading:

believe is no more In a mans power then his Stature or his featur;
 & he that tells me I must change my opinion for his, because tis the
 truer & y^c Better, wthout other arguments, that have y^c force of
 conviction, may as well tell me, I must Change my Grey Eyes, for
 others like his that are Black, Because these are Lovelier & more in
 Esteem.

Medley started December with a brief further exploration of faith and rejection of atheism, this time from Dr John Scott (1638–95). But then he returned to poetry and a theme now familiar, in the delightful words of Thomas Fitzgerald (c.1695–1752), classicist and head usher at Westminster:

No Glory I covet, no Riches I want,
 Ambition is nothing to me
 The one thing I Beg of kind Heaven to grant
 Is a mind Independent & free.

wth passions unruffled untainted wth Pride,
 By Reason my life let me Square;
 The wants of my nature are cheaply Suplid
 & y^c Rest is but folly & care

The Blessings w^{ch} providence freely has lent
 I'll Justly & gratefully prise
 Whilst Sweet meditation & Chearfull content
 Shall make me both healthy & wise

What better caption to a portrait of Samuel Medley could there be (at least as he would have wished to see himself)?

As Christmas approached, Medley was reading Charles de Marguetel de Saint-Denis, seigneur de Saint-Evremond (1613/14–1703), a gentleman of letters and amateur moralist who had had to flee from France for his criticism of Cardinal Mazarin and whom Charles II welcomed – the latter gave him time for his writing by appointing him keeper of the ducks in St James's Park! The brief moralizing passage he chose included the observation that: 'There is nothing more Insupportable in the world – than a friend that is false.' One wonders whether news of the back stabbing that went on in embassy circles might have had something to do with that choice.

In the spring of 1735 Medley found some moralizing snippets by Dr Scott and meditations on the life of Christ by two other unidentified divines, February's passage from Dr Scott being a rant that echoed, in tone, Tillotson's anti-popery passage. Then, in May, Medley returned to poetry with the following epigram:

I dreamt y^t Buried in my fellow clay
 Close by a Comon Beggars side I lay
 & as so mean a neighbour shockt my prid
 thus like a corps of quality I cryd –
 Scoundrel! be gon – hence forward touch me not
 More Maners Learn & off a distance Rot
 Scoundrel! In Still & haughty tone cryd he
 Proud lump of clay. I scorn thy words & the
 Hear all are Equal. Here our Lodging Joyne
 This is my Resting place & y^t is thine

Medley gave as the title to this poem 'Lord Rotchesters Dreame', but the title may well have reflected some mischief-making on the part of the publication in which he found it; it would have seemed reasonable for the grossly amoral rake, John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester (1647–80), to have thought it up, but he was apparently not the author.

Late in May, again reading the periodical *The Guardian*, Medley noted down two passages concerned with the futility of searching for happiness, one by Matthew Prior (1664–1721), poet and diplomat, the other by John Dryden (1631–1700), poet, playwright, essayist and 'the father of English criticism'. He picked up this theme again in two passages from Archbishop Tillotson, apparently noted in August along with an optimistic account of sins forgiven, by the poet John Oldham (1653–83). Meanwhile, in June, he seems to have been reading Pope's lengthy moral *Essay on Man*, which was published only the previous year. If the selections chosen are in fact Medley's own, his critical eye was well in line with that of posterity: three of the five passages quoted are among the fourteen that nowadays appear in the *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*.⁷⁰

There then seems to have been a gap of four months in his reading (or at least in his noting of quotations), coinciding with the doubtless traumatic period of Kinnoull's dismissal and replacement. However, with Fawkenner in post and Kinnoull at a loose end, Medley evidently found

time on his hands and obtained and evidently enjoyed the works of the Reverend John Pomfret (1667–1703). Medley’s interests and sympathies seemed to have coincided well with Pomfret’s, whose poetry ranged from love poems to ‘exaltation of the genteel country life, eschewing extremes’;⁷¹ from ‘meditation on God’s unity, eternity, power, wisdom, providence, omnipresence, immutability, justice and goodness’⁷² to *Reason*, ‘an unrelenting critique of the limits of human rationality’⁷³.

Samuel Medley’s son Guy was married in 1735. We have no indication in the diary of any correspondence between father and son, or any mention of either the wedding or, indeed, of his son. This omission may of course simply be a reflection of his main intentions in keeping the diary – presumably just to record local happenings and observations. One must be tempted to wonder, however, whether the choice of the first of Pomfret’s poems from which he has quoted could have been prompted by news of the wedding. It is, in fact, lines 1–18 of a poem, running to 111 lines, ‘On the marriage of The Earl of A— with the Countess of —:’⁷⁴

Triumphant Beauty never Looks So Gay,
 as on y^e morning of a Nuptial Day.
 Love yn within a Larger Circle moves
 new Graces adds, & Ev’ry Charm Improvs
 while Hymen does his Sacred Rites prepare
 the Busy Nymphs attend y^e trembling fair
 whose veins are swell’d wth an unusal heat
 & Eagar pulses wth Strange Motions beat
 Alternate Passions various thoughts Impart
 & painful Joys Distend her throbbing heart:
 Her fears are great, & her desired are Strong,
 the Minutes fly too fast – yet Stay too Long:
 now She is Reddy – y^e next moment not
 all things are done – yn Something is forgot
 She fears – yet wishes y^e Strang work were done
 Delays – yet is Impatient to be Gone
 Disorders thus from Ev’ry Thought arise
 what Love perswades, I know not wt Denies

Medley’s next two choices from Pomfret suggest extraordinary depth of reading and intellectual awareness. In 1700, Pomfret wrote a poem entitled *Reason* in the following context:

the debates concerning the doctrine of the Trinity were [then] carried on with so much heat by the clergy, one against another, that King William was obliged to interpose his royal authority, by putting an end to that pernicious controversy through an act of parliament strictly forbidding any person whatsoever to publish their notions on this subject. [The poem is] a very severe though just satire upon the antagonists engaged in that dispute.⁷⁵

Medley selected two consecutive passages that were, in a sense, complementary, concerning rival factions in philosophical debate in religion and in medicine. This seems a remarkable choice, particularly if we take it to imply some understanding of the arguments involved. In the passages Medley selected, Pomfret named eight religious philosophers and ten medical men. However, without some knowledge of their standpoints, the passages are meaningless.

Whether reflecting his master's or his own problems (of job security or health or both), there are also three passages concerned with the suffering and bearing of affliction, for instance:

None lives in this tumultuous State of things
 where Ev'ry Morning Some new trouble brings
 But bold Inquietudes will Break his Rest
 and Gloomy thoughts disturb his anxious Breast
 those y^r have Weather'd a tempestuous night
 & find a calm approachin wth the light
 will not, unles their Reason they Disown
 Still make those Dangers present y^r are gone

Pomfret's 'A pastoral essay on the death of Queen Mary 1694' also evidently intrigued Medley. It was a eulogy on the character of the Queen (Celestia in the poem) put in the mouths of pastoral characters Strephon the shepherd and the 'nymph' Cosmelia, all three worshippers of Pan. In his transcription, however, Medley carefully omitted evidence of this device, to the extent of substituting 'God' for 'Pan'.

From another pastoral poem, Medley lifted the following passage, which, at least taking it out of context as he did, was fully in line with his faith and optimism:

all Things Conspiree to make My Ruin Sure
 wn Wounds are Mortall they admit no Cure
 But heaven Sometimes dos a Miraclous thing
 wn our last hope is just upon the wing
 and in a moment drives those clouds away
 whose sullen Darkness hid a Glorious day

The final passage Medley selected for entry in his diary is from a translation of writings by Urbain Chevreau (1613–1701), which presumably appealed to his sense of humour:

There are certain natural Antipathies, – w^{ch} are very odd, – Some persons of Qualiity, – who wod fall into fainting fits at the Smell of Roses, & yet lov'd y^e Smell of Jonquils & tuberoses: – a Governour of a frontier City In f---. who fell into Convulsions at the y^e Sight of Carp's Eggs a Lady who was Subject to the Same at the Sight of a Cray fish wn cut – Erasmus – had So great an aversion to fish yⁱ he Could not Smell one without falling into a feavour – & ambrose Parry could never See an Eel on y^e table but he fell into a Swoon – Joseph Scaliger – never Eat Milk, Cardan had an aversion to Eggs; Vladislaus K- of poland – had an aversion to apples – Julius Caesar Scaliger to Cresses – if du Chesne a secretary in france – toucht an apple – Blood wod Run out of his nose – Henry y^e 3^d Could not stay in a Room where there was a Cat – the Same So wth y^e duke of Schomberg – a Gentleman of Lorraine – was so afraid of cats – that he wod Bleed at the nose – if he heard them at a distance a person of honour was So afraid of a Hedgehog that he fancied his bowels was was Eaten up for a long time after – a Gentleman very Stout yet Could not hold his Sword in his hand wn he Saw a Mouse – a Gascoyner was So afraid of the Sound of a cymball that he could never hear it wth out making water – Some cant Endure to se spiders M. Vaughneim would fall into a fit or Run away from a pig Rosted.

He quoted selectively, however, omitting, in noting that 'Some cant Endure to se spiders', this additional delight: 'I have seen others who freely Eat them in Merriment!'

We cannot know to what extent the selection of passages that Medley noted was representative of his reading. We cannot know how far he was

guided in his reading and by whom, though obvious candidates are the Levant Company chaplain, the Reverend Thomas Payne, and Lord Kinnoull. We also cannot know to what extent his reading reflected the overall content of the library or libraries to which he had access – almost certainly the Levant Company library and Lord Kinnoull's personal library.

Thus, we do not know whether the omission of certain writers whose work we might expect to find in many libraries of the period reflected his relative lack of interest in these writers, omission of them in his reading (whether by his choice or through advice he was accepting), or absence of their works from the libraries he was using.

We do not find quotations from Milton, Bunyan or Swift; from the metaphysical poets Donne, Marvell, Cowley, Crashaw and Cleveland, or from the mystical poets Vaughan, Herbert and Traherne. Perhaps they are absent because, in general, they belonged to an earlier generation than those quoted and were therefore out of tune with the mainstream of 'current' reading. Perhaps Milton's Puritanism was too extreme for Medley (or for Payne). Perhaps Bunyan was socially unacceptable in Kinnoull's library. Perhaps Donne's spiritual agonies and the other metaphysical poets' intensity of feeling were too much for Medley (and/or Payne) – Medley preferred to look for sources of peace of mind and 'happiness'. Though many of the poets from which he quoted were men in the 'real' world of fops and bitter satire, there was a clear accent on serious unemotional passages; he showed a noticeable absence of humour, and tended to avoid the gratuitous and what could be regarded as self-indulgent. It is tempting to guess which of the books from which he quoted had come from which library and with whose recommendation: certainly Rochester, Etherege and Sedley seemed more likely to have been enjoyed by Lord Kinnoull than by Thomas Payne!

Medley did not offer opinions on, or criticism of, the passages he chose (with the exception of a few words in relation to Mr Squire). However, the adventurousness of his reading, even allowing for the likelihood of his being guided and hence of his choices of quotations, surely indicates that he had a lively and well-educated mind. We know nothing of his education or other aspects of his life before he joined Lord Kinnoull, but his son Guy, grandson Samuel and great-grandson Samuel all had careers that demonstrated noteworthy intellectual ability,⁷⁶ the last being associated with the foundation of University College, London.

There is evidence to suggest that Medley probably came from Brodsworth, near Pontefract, where Lord Kinnoull and his family were

living in 1729, and may have been recruited there. The owner of the Brodsworth estate in 1625, Darcy Wentworth, provided an endowment of £10 per annum for a schoolmaster; if Medley was brought up at Brodsworth he could have been taught by Edward Brookes MA (schoolmaster 1662–74) and/or Benjamin Greaves (schoolmaster 1674–92), and would thus have learnt ‘the principles of religion and to read and write’,⁷⁷ giving him an educational start not widely available nationally.

Samuel Medley’s faith

Samuel Medley’s faith was clearly central to his life. He was living in a period of shift from a religion experienced intensely and personally towards a greater emphasis on public worship and appropriate social behaviour. But while he looked for peace of mind through reasoned argument, his faith was firm and very personal. As we have seen above in the section on *Samuel Medley’s reading matter*, he clearly read, noting passages of particular interest to him, from the works of writers on moral issues and practical Christianity, on current debate within the Protestant Church and on problems of faith, with attention and without fear of tackling difficult authors. He seems no revolutionary in his attitudes and was reliably and strongly anti-papist, as we have seen elsewhere. Greek Orthodox practices, too, albeit not thus identified, were also too much for him, for on 28 November 1734, he writes:

I went in the State Liveray – to St demetree Chappel – the funerall of M^r Temoneys aunt a young woman where I Se more Superstition then I have Seen Before – w^{ch} is to teadious and vexatious to Express – a 100 & more Popeish priests – some 100^d of wax Candles all the way Beside flamb’g Incence holly watter &c – L^d Enable me to keep my heart wth Dilligence to y^e truth as it is in Jesus.

Samuel Medley comes across as having a straightforward, firm faith and a clear view of the role of Christ crucified:

25 December 1735

The Nativity of my dear Redeemer Jesus Christ.

6 April 1735

Sunday Easter day ... Comemorating the death & Resurrection of my Dear Redeem^r.

When he observes (more than usual) danger from the plague on 22 July 1735, he adds: 'Lord preserve us & keep us all.' Frequently, in gratitude, especially when his gout improved, he adds a 'Blessed be my good God', variously abbreviated.

He was probably the most regular attendant at chapel and follower of Mr Payne's sermons, whatever the discouragements. On 23 March 1735, he writes 'His Ex-y at Church M^r Pain preach^d – from the Same text 4 Sundays succesivly.' Medley occasionally (for example on 15 September 1734) sounds mildly resentful of the paucity of merchants at church compared with their enthusiasm for dinner: 'Sunday M^r Pain Read prayers in the Dineing room – M^s Savage there – & Some of y^e merchants – But all there at Diner.'

On Sunday 11 January 1736 he has a fit of perhaps excessive humility when he writes: 'M^r pain Preached & Give the Comunion – there was M^r Pemberton Mr Abbot y^e 2 M^s Savage & 2 more & my poor unworthy me.'

In February 1736, Mr Payne went home to England for good, 'to take possession of a small dignity with little Proffit & less trouble which the Archbishop of Canterbury has given him':⁷⁸ On Sunday 15 February 1736 Medley notes 'No Service M^r Pain gon.' For the rest of the year, through to 9 November when the diary ends, there were no more services in the Levant Company Chapel or at Belgrade and Medley evidently resigned himself to private prayer only, even at Easter.

But it was on his birthdays that he took stock and offered his prayers in a style that showed clearly how he viewed himself in relation to his God:

Opposite 8 April 1734

this day – (to the Best of my Memory) I am 67 years of age L^d forgive me wⁱ is past – & keep me from sin (by the power of his Grace) – & goodnes & mercy – the Rest of my days – & Comfort me In my old age wth thy devine protection & guidance of thy holy Spirit.

8 April 1735

My Birth day – I am now 68 years old Lord preserve me against the power of all my Enemies.

It is hard to believe that there are any! However, we do not have any evidence of what those under him thought of him.

Thursday 8 April 1736

This day I am to the best of my knowledge 69 years old Lord forgive all my Sins & follis & keep me by thy grace for time to Come – for y^e sake of my dear Redeemer.

But perhaps there is no better way to encapsulate Samuel Medley's faith and attitude to life than through the poem that appears opposite 15 March 1735, the composition of which we can, with fair confidence, attribute to Samuel himself:

A hymn to God – by a person in foreign parts

While off from Clime to Clime I go,
ordaind to travel to & fro
to be my gaurd by land and sea
who have I who my god but thee,
& let me boast this glorious aid
for who preserves like him y^t made
wt armour shields like thy defence
& is there care like providence
wn on y^e deep i take my way
& Round my Bark y^e Billows play
How shall i scape y^t Greedy wave
Wert thou not Reddy there to save
How shall I climb yon Summits brow
& Shun y^e yauning Gulph below
wert thou not Still my Saviour by
to fix my Step, & poynt my Eye
I turn me off – the labour past
To view Some Scene behind me cast
An alps perhaps; or appenine
& wonder; But y^t work was thine
By y^e my feeble strength sustains
The heighth of hills & length of plains
By y^e I track y^e Mazy wood
& smoothly pas y^e Rapid flood
if now i urg my teadious cours
till toil & day-light pall my force
thy hand brings on y^e Evening Close
& marks y^e Inn for my Repose

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

or if I Stae Ere morning light
& now bewail y^e Lingerin Night
thou bidst y^e Sun his beams display
& look y^e darkness into day
In wilds, where Stroll y^e Savage brood
Or men more savage, Lurk for Blood
If these I awe – or those decline
Tis by no art, nor power of mine
Here flames of lightening Sulpher Rise
Here Sudden deluges Surprise
Here frequent Earthquaks Round me Jar
& here I breath in poyson'd aire
But dont I Every where advance
thro ambushes of death & chance
yet all things wait on thy decree
& death & chance are Ruld by thee
thou'rt still my present help & stay
for, oh thou canst not be away
I see thee, feel thee all abroad
& tho tis nature allso tis god
Hail Maker & preserver thou
Thou Chief above; & Chief below
Whose mercies no-where never fail;
Hail Maker & preserver Hail!

This perhaps suggests a rather complacent and conventional view of divine providence; when he did encounter setbacks or suffering, of others or in his own health problems, he did not seem to see them as divine punishment, but simply looked, through prayer, for their resolution, and was duly grateful when they were resolved.

Appendix 1

Biographical notes in relation to the diary and the text

★ Names not appearing in the diary.

The biographies of authors Medley quoted or mentioned are given separately on the website www.leginipress.co.uk.; See separate Glossary for Turkish officials by title. Numbers of entries in Samuel Medley's diary are shown as, for instance '(SM17)' meaning 17 entries.

Abbott, Mr (SM2): attended church; perhaps a local resident.

Addames (SM1): captain of the sloop that carried Samuel Medley and others to HMS *Torrington* for their journey to Constantinople; mentioned 16 October 1733 only.

★Ahmed III: Sultan 1703–30. See *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3.

★Ahmet Pasha: see Bonneval.

★Ali Pasha: see Hekimoglu Ali Pasha.

Allexander (SM1): dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull.

Amilla (SM1): dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull.

★Augustus II of Saxony was the King of Poland whose death, in 1733, precipitated the War of Polish Succession. See *The war of the Polish succession* in Chapter 4.

baker, the (SM7): a friend and walking companion of Medley. See *The Butler and the Steward* in Chapter 5. See also Rasoes.

Ball Jno (SM1): translator of Gilles, Pierre, of Albi: *The antiquities of Constantinople*, 1729, mentioned by Medley opposite 18 February 1734.

Ballmore (?) (SM1): dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull, possibly French. See '*Great Turks*', *ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.

Baptista. (SM3): a tailor.

Barker, Mr Benjamin (SM13): a merchant;¹ attended church and dined with His Ex-y; also Medley dined, walked and drank with him. See *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* in Chapter 5 and *The merchants*, also in Chapter 5.

★Barker, Edward: among Levant Company signatories in England, 14 September 1736.²

- *Bartolini, Orazio: Venetian secretary who covered the interregnum between Dolfin and Emo, 1729–30.
- Basshaw, Ishmael: see Ishmael Pasha.
- Berwick, Duke of (1670–1734) (SM1): he was a bastard son of James II, was naturalized a Frenchman in 1703 and had a most distinguished military career, being in command of the French forces on the Rhine when, in June 1734 at the age of 64, in the trenches at Philippsbourg and exposed to fire from both sides, he was beheaded by either an Austrian or a French cannon ball.
- Bland, Mr Henry (SM1): he succeeded Sandys after an interregnum in which Mr William (?) Wallace acted as *Cancellier*.³
- Bollang(e) (SM5): occasional walking companion of Medley. See *Messrs Elliot, Bollange, Franceway et alia* in Chapter 5.
- Bol(l)ton, Captin (SM5): captain of a ship in dock 6 February–19 March 1735 and apparently for three or four days in August 1736. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Bonneval, General Claude-Alexandre, Comte de (1675–1747) (SM1): having fallen out with Louis XIV and Prince Eugene, he converted to Islam, adopting the name Ahmet Pasha, and became effectively a mercenary in the service of the Ottomans, modernizing and Europeanizing, in style, the Turkish army, though the fall of Topal Osman Pasha as Grand Vizier much reduced his influence. See *Diplomatic matters* and *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.
- *Bragiotti, Antonio: son of a local friend of Lord Kinnoull, he became a *giovane di lingua* to Thalmann in 1734. See 5. *Mr Brown and the giovani di lingua* in Chapter 3.
- Bragioty (& other spellings) = Bragiotti (SM8): he and his son Antonio dine with Kinnoull sometimes. See Bragiotti.
- Brown, Mr Thomas (SM43): travelled out to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party. Engaged in walking, goods-purchasing (especially cloth for Kinnoull) and drinking companion for Medley, with whom he seemed to have shared a room at times. See *Mr Brown and the giovani di lingua* in Chapter 5.
- *Calkoen, Cornelius (never named by Medley): see diary entries indexed under 'Dutch'. As ambassador of the States General to Constantinople, 1727–43, his main achievements were in terms of Levantine trade. Later, he was ambassador in Dresden and Poland. See Chapters 3 and 4, and 'Great Turks', *ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- Cambell, Widdow (SM1): at church with Medley on one occasion.
- Carlson = Carleson, Edvard (1704–67): many diary entries. He was a long-term Swedish 'visitor', along with von Höpken, with whom Lord Kinnoull enjoyed spending time. See especially *A Swedish sideshow* in Chapter 4 and 'Great Turks', *ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5. Later responsibilities, after his diplomatic role in Constantinople, which continued until 1745, included being a governor of the Bank of Sweden and Under-secretary-of-State.

APPENDIX 1

- *Cavendish, William, 2nd Duke of Devonshire (c.1673–1729): Lord Justice and Lord President of the Council; probably influential in Lord Kinnoull's appointment as ambassador. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1.
- *Charles VI: Holy Roman Emperor and ruler of Austria from 1711 to 1740. See *Diplomatic matters* in Chapter 3.
- *Charles XII: King of Sweden. Having been defeated by Peter the Great in 1709, he had ruled Sweden from the Ottoman Empire until 1715. See *A Swedish sideshow* in Chapter 4.
- Chezwell (SM1): see Chiswell.
- Chilton, Captain (SM3): captain of ship in port in October 1736. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Chirico, Luca: many entries under 'Luca', 'Luka', etc. Lord Kinnoull's first dragoman, until eventually sacked. See especially *The dragomans Luca Chirico and Antonio Pisani* in Chapter 4 and *Lord Kinnoull's staff* in Chapter 5.
- Cingria, Pietro: Medley's diary was partly written on paper on which accounts had been kept: this was one of the account holders: see 23 January 1734.
- *Chiswell, Richard (junior) (1673–1751): traveller and merchant, who travelled extensively in the east and wrote several journals, unpublished. He was an MP and a director of the Bank of England.⁴ One mention, as Chezwell. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Clark(e), Wm (also Mrs, Wm. Junior = Billy, and Betsy) (SM88): travelled out to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party. Almost certainly Lord Kinnoull's steward. Companion, colleague and buyer of victuals; walks, drinks, shoots and goes to auctions with SM. See *The butler and the steward* in Chapter 5.
- *Constantine, Robert: merchant at Constantinople and uncle of the merchant James Jennings. In Turkey for 30 years, his daughter Elizabeth married Thalmann; died 1731.⁵
- *Contarini: Venetian ambassador who replaced Angelo Emo in 1734.
- Coutery (?), Coutrees, Cutorere (?) (SM4): dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull on four occasions; secretary and priest to Count Stadnicki, according to Medley. See *'Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- *Craigie, Robert, of Glendoick (c.1688–1760): Lord Advocate (1742) and trustee of the Kinnoull estate. See *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4.
- Crispo, Giovanni: Medley's diary is partly written on paper on which accounts have been kept: this was one of the account holders: see 19 February 1734.
- Cuttroe (?) (SM1): possibly there is a confusion with Coutery (?) above but he is also possibly one of several Frenchmen who visited Lord Kinnoull for dinner on 7 December 1734. See *'Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- *Damat Ibrahim Pasha: Grand Vizier on Kinnoull's arrival, murdered 30 September 1730.
- *Dandallo: Gentleman of the Horse to the Venetian *bailo* Emo. See *'Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- Dandilo (SM6): see Dandallo.

- *Dease Dr Francis: ‘Dr of Physick’ and probably the Levant Company doctor for a period.⁶ See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- Death, Dee(a)th, Mr (SM4): probably a local resident; possibly but probably not a merchant. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- De Flander (SM2): twice a dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull. See ‘*Great Turks*’, *ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- *Delafaye, Charles (1677–1762): Under-secretary-of-State, southern division, with whom Kinnoull corresponded.
- *De Saussure, César: a gentleman of leisure who travelled out to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull’s party. Occasional dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull. See especially *The journey out* in Chapter 1. (See also Soseer.)
- Dess, Dr (SM1): see Dease.
- Deval (SM1): Medley dined with him on 12 September 1736.
- *Devonshire, Duke of: see Cavendish.
- *Dolfin, Daniele: Venetian *bailo* 1726–29.
- Dominico (SM1): dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull. See ‘*Great Turks*’, *ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- Dorrell (SM1): entertained Medley on board the *Tigress*; perhaps an officer. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Dover, Dr (SM1): quoted by Medley. See *Health problems* in Chapter 5.
- *Drummond, Andrew: a London goldsmith to whom Kinnoull owed money in 1731; he was also one of Kinnoull’s bankers. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1 and *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3.
- *Dunster, William: Deputy Governor of the Levant Company in London.⁷
- *Dupplin, Viscount: see Hay, George, and Hay, Thomas.
- *Edwards: *Cancellier* prior to Kinnoull succeeding Stanyan.⁸
- Ekarr, Ecarr (SM3): thrice a dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull. See ‘*Great Turks*’, *ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- Elliot Jno (SM4): travelled out to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull’s party. Walking companion and probably colleague of Medley. All diary entries in June 1734 or earlier. See *Messrs Elliot, Bollange, Franceway et alia* in Chapter 5.
- *Elton, Captain: captain of the *Nile*.⁹
- *Emo, Angelo: Venetian *bailo* 1730–35. Not named by Medley but there are many diary entries indexed under ‘Venetian’. See *Communications* and *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3, *Further pressure* in Chapter 4, and ‘*Great Turks*’, *ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- *Erskine, John, Earl of Mar: involved in the 1715 uprising, he became the Pretender’s Secretary of State.
- *Erskine, Margaret, née Hay (d.1707): Wife of John Erskine, Earl of Mar and sister of George Hay, later Lord Kinnoull.
- Esperance(s) (SM3): acquaintance of Medley.
- Eugene, Prince (SM1): General in charge of the Imperial Austrian forces.
- *Fagel, Francois (1659–1746): *Griffier* (effectively Foreign Secretary) to the States General to whom Calkoen wrote dispatches.

APPENDIX 1

- Falconer (Fallkoner), S(i)r Ev(e)rard (Ev-(d)s) (SM28): see Fawkener, Everard.
- Fanshaw (SM1): perhaps an officer of the *Portland*. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- *Fawkener, Edward: brother of Sir Everard Fawkener. Levant Company merchant.¹⁰
- *Fawkener, Sir Everard (1694–1758) (SM28): Levant Company trader and ambassador to Constantinople (1735–42) replacing Lord Kinnoull.¹¹ A long-term friend of Voltaire, he was later secretary to the Duke of Cumberland and joint Paymaster-general. See *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3, *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4 and *Lord Kinnoull's staff* in Chapter 5.
- *Fawkener, Kenelm: another of the Fawkener family involved in Levant Company trade.¹²
- *Finch: English Resident in Sweden, from where he writes to Rondeau, 1734–5.¹³ Later, British minister in St Petersburg.
- *Fleury: French foreign minister during the period of Lord Kinnoull's embassy.
- Franceway (SM5): friend and colleague of Medley. See *The butler and the steward* in Chapter 5.
- *Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony, was favoured by Russia and Austria to become King of Poland on the death of his father Augustus II in 1733. He became King Augustus III. See *The war of the Polish succession* in Chapter 4.
- Gallio (SM1): Medley mentioned him as a malefactor with 'treasonable designs' who was hiding from justice in Constantinople and had died. He is described as 'verry enthusiasticall or affected to apeare so to the turks'.
- Genings (SM4): see Jennings.
- *Gerarchi, Andronico: a retired British embassy dragoman whom Kinnoull brought back into service in 1735.
- German J (SM4): perhaps steward to Lord Kinnoull prior to November 1733. See *The butler and the steward* in Chapter 5.
- *Ghika: the Chief Dragoman to the Porte during the period of Medley's diary.
- Gribling [Samuel Griblin] (SM4): travelled out to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party, but had evidently returned by 1734. Correspondent of Medley, in England. See *Correspondents* in Chapter 5.
- Hack, Captin (SM3): dinner guest of Kinnoull – there is no mention of a ship. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- *Halil, Patrona: leader of revolt in Constantinople in 1730. See *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3.
- Hamshire, Captain (SM11): captain of a ship in Constantinople 7 January 1735–12 March 1735. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Hanger Mr [William] (SM11): a merchant who seems to live near Luca's 'keeosk'. He attends Mr Payne's sermons, dines with Lord Kinnoull, who also dines with him, but so too do Medley and friends. Levant Company treasurer at Constantinople 1730–31.¹⁴ See *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3, *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* and *The merchants* in Chapter 5.
- *Harley, Robert, 1st Earl of Oxford (1661–1724): Lady Abigail Kinnoull's father;

- 'Prime Minister' 1710–14; Lord High Treasurer 1711; founder of the South Sea Company 1711; impeached for high treason and imprisoned 1714–17, but subsequently acquitted. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1.
- *Harley, Edward, 2nd Earl of Oxford (1699–1755): Lady Abigail Kinnoull's brother. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1.
- *Harrington, Lord: see *Stanhope, William.
- *Harley, Abigail: an aunt of Lady Abigail Kinnoull. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1.
- *Hay, George Henry (1689–1758), *Viscount Dupplin (1709–19), *8th Earl of Kinnoull (from 1719): ambassador to Constantinople (1729–35). See especially *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1, Chapters 3 and 4, and *At His Excellency's service* in Chapter 5.
- *Hay, Abigail, née Harley (c.1690–1750), Lady Dupplin (1709–19), Countess of Kinnoull (from 1719): daughter of Robert Harley, 1st Earl of Oxford and Lord Kinnoull's wife. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1 and *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4.
- *Hay of Cromlix, John, Jacobite Duke of Inverness (1691–1740): Lord Kinnoull's brother. Involved in the 1715 Jacobite uprising, after which he was in France and then Italy as a devoted and trusted servant of the Pretender, though himself a Protestant. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1.
- *Hay, John, 4th Marquess Tweeddale (1695–1762): politician, principal Secretary of State for Scotland (1742) and chairman of trustees of the Kinnoull estate. See *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4.
- *Hay, Marjorie: wife of John Hay of Cromlix.
- *Hay, Thomas, Viscount Dupplin, 9th Earl of Kinnoull (from 1758): elder son of George Henry Hay who became a distinguished politician and privy councillor (1758). See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* and *The journey out* in Chapter 1, and *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4.
- *Hay-Drummond, Robert: younger son of George Henry Hay who became Archbishop of York. See *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4.
- *Hekimoglu Ali Pasha: Grand Vizier 1732–35. See *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.
- Hillars, Mr (SM6): Medley called to dine or to drink wine with him occasionally. See *Messrs Elliot, Bollange, Franceway et alia* in Chapter 5.
- Hipps (SM4): Sups or dines with Lord Kinnoull, as do his brother and two of his house guests. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- Hogg, Captain (SM2): dines with Kinnoull on arrival and to take leave; no indication of what ship. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Hoppkins (Hopkins, Hop—s), Bar(r)on: many diary entries. See von Höpken.
- Humpheries, Mr (SM34): Medley goes to dine with him, together with Clark or Matth or, especially, Robison, Wallace, Brown or Jones. No diary entries before 16 July 1735. See *Messrs Matth, Humpheries, Lynwood and Wallace* in Chapter 5.

APPENDIX 1

- *Ishmael Pasha (= Basshaw Ishmael): Grand Vizier from 17 July 1735. Various entries under ‘Grand Vizir’. See Chapter 4.
- *Jennings, James: Levant Company merchant.¹⁵ Treasurer in Constantinople, 1735–36. He was nephew of Robert Constantine whose daughter married Thalmann. See *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* and *The merchants* in Chapter 5.
- Johanes (SM1): perhaps a footman.
- Jones Mr (SM4): an occasional companion of Medley in 1736, possibly a colleague. See *Messrs Elliot, Bollange, Franceway et alia* in Chapter 5.
- Kininsky (Kinisky, Kinsky, Staninsky), Count (= Count of Poland): many diary entries. See Stadnicki.
- Kinnoull, Earl of: see Hay, George, and Hay, Thomas.
- Labon, M (SM2): Two diary entries, both in the company of Baron Zy, dining with Lord Kinnoull. See ‘*Great Turks*’, *ambassadors and their staff* and *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- Lacount, Monsieur (SM2): the French steward. See *Messrs Elliot, Bollange, Franceway et alia* in Chapter 5.
- Laister (and family including three sons). (SM3): dinner guests of Lord Kinnoull. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- Leaster: the Leasters, the bird-catchers (23 September 1734) are probably the Laisters: see above.
- Lee, Mr (SM2): joined ‘Mr Lyle’s’ firm in 1735 (See Lyle entry). See *The merchants* and *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* in Chapter 5.
- *Leszczynski, Stanislaus (SM1): father-in-law of Louis XV of France, who was declared King of Poland in August 1733 but whom Imperial forces removed. See *The war of the Polish succession* in Chapter 4.
- Levit (SM2): a merchant. See *The merchants* and *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* in Chapter 5.
- *Leytstar, Klara became the wife of Edvard Carleson.
- *Leytstar, Peter: Dutch treasurer in Constantinople c.1740.
- *Leytstar, Petronella became the wife of Carl Fredrik von Höpken.
- Linn (SM1): ‘Chaplin to the ship’, probably the *Nile*. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- *Lisle, Captain: Brother of John and Charles Lisle. A Levant Company captain. See *The merchants* and *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- *Lisle, Charles: Levant Company merchant of Messrs Lisle & Maydwell and, from 1737, Messrs Lisle, Lee & Lisle, involved in Aleppo trade. He, or possibly another brother, was MP for Southampton.¹⁶ See *The merchants* and *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- *Lisle, John: Levant Company merchant based at Constantinople of Messrs Lisle & Maydwell and, from 1737, Messrs Lisle, Lee & Lisle. Treasurer in Constantinople 1736–39.¹⁷ See *The Petrie affair* in Chapter 3, and *The merchants* and *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Long, Capⁿ (SM6): a visiting ship’s captain. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- *Louis XV: King of France during the period of Lord Kinnoull’s embassy. See

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

Diplomatic matters and *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3, and *The war of the Polish succession* in Chapter 4.

Lucka(s) (SM26): see Chirico, Luca.

*Lupart, Pierre: merchant of Messrs Lupart & Lee, involved in Aleppo trade.¹⁸ See *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3.

Lyle, Capⁿ (SM6): see Lisle, Captain.

Lyle Mr (SM12): see Lisle, Charles and Lisle, John.

Lynwood Mr [Jos] (SM23): Travelled out to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party. An occasional walking and dining companion of Medley, when resident in the same place as him. See *Messrs Matth, Humpheries, Lynwood and Wallace* in Chapter 5.

*Mahmud I: Sultan from 1730. See diary entries indexed as Grand Signor. See *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3, and *The Persian war* in Chapter 4.

Madam, M-m: see Sabreau, Judith.

Madewell = Maydwell, Cutts (SM13): a Levant Company merchant trading through Messrs Lisle & Maydwell.¹⁹ Treasurer in Constantinople 1730–32. Medley dined with him sometimes; he dined with Lord Kinnoull. See *The merchants* and *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* in Chapter 5.

*Magrini: dragoman of Ragusa.

Maner (?) (SM1): possibly a misspelling of Monier or Manny.

Manny (SM1): acquaintance of Medley.

*Marchant, Jacob: a Swiss watchmaker with whom de Saussure lodged. See *Topography and local population* in Chapter 2.

*Marchant, Captain Willoughby: a Levant Company captain of the *Thames*.²⁰ See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.

Matth, Jno (SM48): travelled out to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party. Colleague, walking, drinking and riding companion of Medley, along with Dr Smith, Mr Robison, Franceway and Brown. See *Messrs Matth, Humpheries, Lynwood and Wallace* in Chapter 5.

Meagaw, Jn (?) (SM1): a mysterious entry opposite 3 August 1734.

Medley, Samuel: writer of the diary. See Appendix 3.

*Medley, Samuel of Aleppo: probably no relation of author of the diary. A merchant of the firm of Pullinger & Medley, which went bankrupt in 1738.²¹

Merchant, Capⁿ (SM6): see Marchant, Captain Willoughby.

Monere, Monear (SM8): see Monier.

*Monier, Louis: secretary to Lord Kinnoull. Travelled to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party. See *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3, *Louis Monier* in Chapter 4 and *'Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.

Mor(i)agy, Colonel (SM4): occasional dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.

*Mosel, M: secretary to Thalmann.²²

Mosso (SM1): dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.

Moxson (SM4): occasional dinner guest of Lord Kinnoull. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.

APPENDIX 1

- *Murray of Ochertyre, Sir Patrick (1681–1735): a distant relative of Lord Kinnoull, previously a friend of his father, who held Lord Kinnoull's power of attorney and managed his affairs in Scotland in his absence from there. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1.
- *Mustafa II: the Sultan deposed in 1703. See *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3.
- *Nadir Shah: see Tamas Kuli Khan.
- *Neplyuev, Ivan (1693–1773): there were four diary entries in which the name was attempted, as Nep(p)le(l)of(f); many more indexed under 'Moscovite'. Son of a poor undistinguished Novgorod landowner, he entered the navy, learnt seamanship in Venice and took part in Venice's war with Turkey 1717–18. Appointed Russian Resident in Constantinople 1721 (aged 28), he negotiated a peace treaty with Turkey to Russia's great advantage c.1724, for which Peter the Great rewarded him generously. He left Constantinople after a long illness in 1735 and later achieved honour and success as a privy counsellor, governor of Kiev and then of Orenberg. See *Diplomatic matters* in Chapter 3, and Chapter 4.
- *Newcastle, Lord: see Pelham-Holles, Thomas.
Osborn, Captin (SM3): his 'ship arrivd' on 27 April 1736. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- *Osman Pasha: see Topal Osman.
- *Ostermann: Russian foreign minister during the period of Lord Kinnoull's embassy. See *The war of the Polish succession* in Chapter 4.
- *Oxford, Earl of: see Harley.
Pain(e) = Payne, The Reverend Thomas (SM108): Levant Company chaplain. See *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* in Chapter 5.
- *Patrona Halil: see Halil, Patrona.
- *Pelham-Holles, Thomas; 1st Duke of Newcastle (1693–1768): one of the wealthiest Whig landowners in England, he helped bring about the succession of George I and was made Duke of Newcastle-upon-Tyne as a reward. He was Secretary of State under Walpole, holding the post for 30 years, and 'Prime Minister', from 1754 to 1756 and 1757 to 1762. See Chapters 1, 3 and 4.
Pemberton (SM10): merchant; attends chapel and dines with Lord Kinnoull. Once mentioned as walking companion of Medley. See *The merchants* and *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* in Chapter 5.
- Perry, Dr (SM1): mentioned 29 March 1736 as the new English doctor. See *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* in Chapter 5.
- *Peter the Great: Emperor of Russia; ruled 1682–1725. See *Diplomatic matters* in Chapter 3 and *A Swedish sideshow* in Chapter 4.
Petre(e) = Petrie, Captain (SM20): captain of the *Tigress* who was in port for two periods during the diary, and had been involved in the '15 gun affair'. See *The Petrie affair* in Chapter and *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Petro (SM1): mentioned 4 October 1735 by Medley as being from Belgrade and having died.
- Pezany, Pizany (SM8): see Pisani.

- Phill (SM4): first mate of the ship *William*.
- Phi(li)ps (SM2): a dining guest of Lord Kinnoull. Apparently a local resident. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- Pinelo(o), Mrs (SM2): an Englishwoman resident at Gallata.
- *Pisani, Antonio: second dragoman to Lord Kinnoull. See *The dragomans Luca Chirico and Antonio Pisani* in Chapter 4 and *Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- Porter (SM18): a friend with whom Medley and some of his colleagues dined from February 1736; no indication that he was a colleague. See *Messrs Elliot, Bollange, Franceway et alia* in Chapter 5.
- *Pullinger, Arthur: trader at Aleppo. (See Medley, Samuel.)
- Purrier (various spellings) (SM12): occasional dining guest of Lord Kinnoull; 'the new French secretary Mr D. Purier' (19 October 1735) may refer to a different person. See *'Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- Quincy, Dr (SM1): Medley mentioned him in connection with his medical dictionary. See *Health problems* in Chapter 5.
- *Rakoczi, Prince Francis (d.1735): an exile to Turkey from Hungary, living at Rodosto, two days' post from Constantinople. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- Ragottcy (SM1): see Rakoczi.
- Rasoets, Raza, Razoo, and other versions: an assortment of diary entries and a range of spellings. The French baker.
- Rego(o)r(e) (SM5): see Rigo.
- Remotee, Captain (SM1): mentioned as 'the French captin', 7 October 1736; presumably captain of the ship that took Kinnoull and retinue homeward. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- *Renaud, Louis Sauveur, Marquis de Villeneuve (1675–1745): French ambassador 1728–40. Medley never named him but the diary recorded 21 home visits; 15 away. See under 'French' in index to diary. Villeneuve achieved particular success, in relation to French interests at the Porte, through his skilful brokering of the Treaty of Belgrade, 1739. See especially *Diplomatic matters* in Chapter 3, *The war of the Polish succession*, *The dragomans Luca Chirico and Antonio Pisani*, *Louis Monier*, *Further pressure* and *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4 and *'Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- *Rigo: Calkoen's secretary. Occasional dinner guest of Kinnoull. See *'Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- *Riso, Giacomo: dragoman and courier for Lord Kinnoull. See *The war of the Polish succession*, *Further pressure*, *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* and *Some conclusions* in Chapter 4.
- Robi(n)son, (Bob(b)y) ('& spouse & childe') (SM36): Exchanges hospitality with Samuel Medley; friend and colleague. Dined particularly with Humpheries, Wallace, Brown and Jones. See *Mr Robi(n)son* in Chapter 5.
- *Robinson, Thomas: English Resident in Vienna. See *Communications* in Chapter 3.
- *Rondeau, Claudius: English Resident in St Petersburg.

APPENDIX 1

- Roos [Rose], Batt [Bart] (SM1): travelled out to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party. Medley mentioned him once (at church in Pera).
- Rowndell (Roundell) (SM4): a correspondent of Medley in England. See *Correspondents* in Chapter 5.
- Ruddy (SM1): visited Medley one day.
- *Sabreau, Mrs Judith: almost certainly the identity of the lady Medley called 'Madam' or 'M-m' – a gentlewoman who acted as housekeeper-companion and perhaps mistress to Lord Kinnoull. Judith Sabreau was the mother of Mrs Ann Sandys. See *'Madam' and Mrs Sandys* in Chapter 5.
- *Sandys, William: secretary to Lord Kinnoull initially and Levant Company *Cancellier*. Travelled to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party. Married Ann Sabreau in March 1731 and went to England in connection with his father's death in about August that year; thereafter being replaced in Constantinople. See *The journey out* in Chapter 1 and *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3.
- Sandys Mrs [Ann née Sabreau] (SM13): married to William Sandys 12 March 1731. See *'Madam' and Mrs Sandys* in Chapter 5.
- Saussure: see under De Saussure.
- Savage Misses (SM10): local residents. There are two of them and another sister, married, in England, and 'old Mrs Savage' who died on 10 February 1735. See *European women in Constantinople in the early eighteenth century* in Chapter 2 and *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- Scott, Captain (SM1): a visiting ship's captain; ship not mentioned. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Sesan (SM5): occasional walking companion of Medley and his colleagues. See *Messrs Elliot, Bollange, Franceway et alia* in Chapter 5.
- Shermetts (SM1): Medley called on him on one occasion.
- *Sierakowski, Count: a Polish envoy who visited Lord Kinnoull in 1733. See *Communications* in Chapter 3.
- *Silahtar Mehmed Pasha: Grand Vizier, following the 1730 rebellion.
- *Skinner: British representative in Florence.
- Smith Dr (SM18): probably travelled out to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party. Colleague and companion of Medley with whom he walked, supped, and went to 'jackoos'. He was probably the Levant Company doctor. See *Dr Smith, Mr Payne and the merchants* in Chapter 5.
- *Snelling, William: Messrs Snelling & Fawkenor were involved in Aleppo trade.²³ Treasurer in London.²⁴
- Soseer (various spellings) (SM7): see De Saussure.
- *Stanhope, William, 1st Earl of Harrington (?1690–1756): ambassador to Spain (1720–27) who helped to broker the Treaty of Seville, 1729. He was Secretary of State, northern division (1730–42) when he was normally based in Whitehall, but he was occasionally with the King in Hanover. He subsequently became Lord President of the Council and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Involved in correspondence referred to in Chapters 3 and 4.

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

- *Stadnicki (Medley misnamed him Kininsky with various spellings): Polish envoy. See *The war of the Polish succession, A Swedish sideshow* and *Further pressure* in Chapter 4, and 'Great Turks', *ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- Stanislaus: see Leszczynski.
- Stanton (SM7): sometimes dined with Lord Kinnoull after church, along with the merchants, though he was not one of them. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- *Stanyan, Abraham: ambassador prior to Lord Kinnoull. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1, and *Introductions, Diplomatic matters* and *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3.
- *Stratford, William: Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1.
- Suckling (SM1): one of the crew of the *William*. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Tallman: many diary entries. See Thalmann.
- *Tamas Kuli Khan = Nadir Shah: Persian leader during the period of Lord Kinnoull's embassy. See *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3 and *The Persian war* in Chapter 4.
- *Thalmann, Baron Leopold: originating from the Tyrol, he became secretary at the Austrian embassy in Constantinople in 1703, before rising to the post of Resident. Increasingly successful in wise management of diplomatic matters, he had to wait until 1736 before being recognized as ambassador of the Emperor of Austria. He performed a delicate balancing act during the war of the Polish succession and in negotiating the renewal of the Karlowitz peace accord, in 1736, but chose to ignore a letter (he said he accidentally burned it!) from the Austrian war council, containing a deadline, which earned him a severe reprimand. He left Constantinople when war broke out between Russia and Turkey in 1737, after which nothing more is known of him. The diary recorded 30 home visits to Kinnoull; 14 away. See Chapters 3 and 4; also 'Great Turks', *ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.²⁵
- *Thalmann, Madam, née Constantine: the Imperial ambassador's wife. See *European women in Constantinople in the early eighteenth century* in Chapter 2.
- The(e)odos(e) (Theodore, Thodosos (?)), Dr, and spouse (SM5): occasional visitor and dining guest of Kinnoull. A medical doctor presumably resident locally. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.
- Timms Capt (SM15): captain of the *Asia*. Dined with Kinnoull. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Timoney, Temonies = [Timone, Angelo] (SM3): a *giovane di lingua* appointed by Stanyan. One entry for him, one for his aunt, who died, and one 'an old Gentlewoman one Mrs Timoney', perhaps another relation, who also died. See *Mr Brown and the giovani di lingua* in Chapter 5.
- Tobin (SM6): probably a visitor only. See *visitors* in Chapter 5.
- Tomazo (SM1): paid for washing. See Appendix 3.
- Tom(p)son (SM4): possibly one of the crew of the *Portland*. See *The visitors* in Chapter 5.

APPENDIX 1

- Toppal Ozman = [Topal Osman] (SM1): Grand Vizier 1732 and then leader of the Turkish forces against Persia; killed in battle in 1733. See *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3 and *The Persian war* in Chapter 4.
- Trecoo (Trecgoe) (SM2): dined with Kinnoull in the company of Purvier; probably French. See *Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- *Vanmour, Jean Baptiste (1671–1737): artist who came to Istanbul in 1699 as part of the French ambassador's entourage and painted portraits, landscapes, Ottoman official ceremonies, Ottoman daily life and Ottoman costume. See *Excursions* in Chapter 2.
- *Veshnyakov = Wieschniakov: many entries under the name Visnicoff (various spellings). Russian envoy who replaced Neptyuef as Resident in 1735. See Chapter 4 and '*Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- Viary (?) (SM1): at the funeral of Mrs Savage.
- Villars, Marshal (SM1): he was with the French forces during the war of the Polish succession. See *The war of the Polish succession* in Chapter 4.
- *Villeneuve, Marquis de: see Renaud.
- Vis(n)icoff: many diary entries (various spellings). see Veshnyakov.
- *von Höpken, Carl Fredrik (1713–78): a long-term Swedish 'visitor', along with Carleson, with whom Lord Kinnoull enjoyed spending time. He was sent, with Carleson, to Constantinople to achieve various diplomatic/trade objectives, including diplomatic recognition, in which he was eventually successful. After his diplomatic role in Constantinople, which continued until 1742, he became a member of parliament and later responsibilities included becoming state secretary for the war committee in 1747. See especially *A Swedish sideshow* in Chapter 4 and *Great Turks', ambassadors and their staff* in Chapter 5.
- *Waldegrave, James 1st Earl Waldegrave (1685–1741): educated in France; married a Roman Catholic but, on her death declared himself a Protestant and took oaths; he advanced rapidly under Walpole despite being tainted with Roman Catholicism (his father had served James II). Ambassador Extraordinary to Paris (1725); ambassador to Vienna (1727–30); ambassador to Paris (1730), to succeed Horace Walpole. Esteemed by Walpole and by George II.
- Wal(l)ace (SM13): probably a colleague; an occasional companion to Medley. See *Messrs Matth, Humpherries, Lynwood and Wallace* in Chapter 5.
- *Wallace, Peter: travelled to Constantinople with Lord Kinnoull's party; Kinnoull described him on 22 April 1731 as 'his clerk'; stood in for Sandys when Sandys went home in September 1731. (But see also William Wallace: possibly the same person.)
- *Wallace, William: acting *Cancellier* in the interregnum between Sandys and Bland, 1733. (But see also Peter Wallace.)
- *Walpole, Horace (1678–1757): brother of Sir Robert Walpole, sometime ambassador to the Netherlands and to France. See *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1, and *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4.

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

- *Walpole, Horace (1717–97): son of Sir Robert Walpole. Writer, connoisseur and collector.
- *Walpole, Sir Robert: ‘Prime Minister’ of England during the period of Lord Kinnoull’s embassy. See especially *the Earl of Kinnoull* in Chapter 1 and *Diplomatic matters* in Chapter 3.
- *Williams, Consul: British consul at Smyrna, 1735.
- *Wortley Montagu, Edward: British ambassador to Constantinople 1717–18.
- *Wortley Montagu, Lady Mary: authoress of *Letters from the Levant* 1716–18; wife of Edward Wortley Montagu. See *European women in Constantinople in the early eighteenth century* in Chapter 2.
- *Zaid Effendi: effectively, foreign minister of Turkey c.1733–35.
Zy, Baron (SM11): dined and rode with Lord Kinnoull. A Hungarian, probably attached to Prince Ragoczi. See *Other residents* in Chapter 5.

Appendix 2

Some members of the Medley family

PART OF THE FAMILY TREE¹

Samuel Medley m ?
1667–1740 or 1761?



Guy Medley m Elizabeth Tonge
1692 or c.1710?–1760



Samuel Medley m Mary Gill
1738–99 1742?–

William
c.1736–60

Guy
c.1740–65



Samuel Medley m1 Susannah Bowley
1769–1857 m2 Elizabeth Smallshaw

Sarah
1768–1834

(further siblings)

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

(IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE ON THE TREE)

Medley, Samuel (1667²–?)

Origin

It seems likely that Samuel Medley came from the Pontefract area, probably from Brodsworth, and he may have been the brother of one, Hayford Medley, born 1665,³ who married Alice Hall at Brodsworth in 1690.⁴

Marriage

The index to the *Archbishop of York's Marriage Bonds and Allegations 1690–1714*⁵ lists a Samuel Medley of Pontefract and Elizabeth Clarkson on 23 May 1691 (but this is no proof of marriage, merely of permission to marry). An Elizabeth Clarkson was baptized at Brodsworth on 1 January 1653⁶ – but this would make Elizabeth 38 at marriage.

Issue

Guy 1692(?).⁷ However, there was a Samuel Medley, an Anabaptist, who appeared in the

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

*Pontefract Baptism Register*⁸ as the father of Elizabeth, Rebekah and John, who were baptized in 1701, 1703 and 1704 respectively. The International Genealogical Index Ancestral File AFN HQN7–BR has Guy born at Cheshunt c.1710 – which is where he apparently worked after his marriage.

Career

Author of the Constantinople diary 1733–36, telling us that he was butler (initially groom to the chamber) to the ambassador, the Earl of Kinnoull, 1729–36. His great grandson, Samuel Medley 1769–1857, included a section on him in the introductory part of his biography of his own father.⁹ This included the information that there were, in addition to the Constantinople diary, his ‘Miscellaneous Observations’ and ‘his more private experiences as a Christian’. His diary includes information that he had friends in Nottingham. According to his great granddaughter Sarah Medley,¹⁰ one of the poems she included in her biography of her father (‘While oft from clime to clime I go’) is by her great grandfather and was written ‘while travelling Secretary to the Earl of Kinnoull’.

Death

His great grandson said he ended his days in Pomfret (=Pontefract). *The Medley Omnibus*¹¹ gives a date of death of 1740, provenance unknown; however, there was a ‘Samuel Medley, servant’, who may have been him, who was buried on 30 June 1761.¹² That would make him about 94 at the time of his death.

Medley, Guy (Guido) (1692¹³ or c.1710¹⁴ –25 October 1760¹⁵)

Origin

Son of Samuel Medley (1667–1740 or 1761?)

Marriage

Married the daughter of William Tonge of Enfield c.1735: ‘Guy Medley of Waltham Abbey in y^c County of Essex Batchelor and Elizabeth Tonge of y^c parish of Cheshunt in y^c county of Hertford Spinster were married by licence by Mr Gough’.¹⁶

Issue

William Tonge Medley (1736–60);¹⁷ Samuel (23 June 1738–17 July 1799);¹⁸ Guy (1740?–65).¹⁹

Career

According to his granddaughter Sarah,²⁰ he was tutor to the Duke of Montague whom he accompanied on a tour through Europe; he was briefly attorney general of St Vincent; he established and ran a boarding school at Cheshunt; he understood and conversed in nine languages (including Latin, Greek, French and German) and was a friend of Isaac Newton and Sir Hans Sloane. Guy was the translator of Peter Kolb, *The present state of the cape of Good Hope ... originally in High German ... Done into English by Mr Medley* (calling himself Guido Medley), 2 vols, London, 1731. (The Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies (HALS) have no relevant Medley in their name index. The Victoria County History

APPENDIX 2

shows no schools established in Cheshunt in the relevant period. For 1736–43, there is a mysterious absence of Cheshunt Parish records (baptisms, marriages, deaths) and charity records and an absence also of records of the Robert Dewhurst School and its Head. Also there are no bishop's transcripts that early. There appears to be no relevant information in any of the several large county histories or in the histories of the Robert Dewhurst School or Cheshunt College. There are no local newspapers that early.)

Medley, Samuel (23 June 1738–17 July 99)²¹

Origin

Son of Guy Medley (1692²² or c.1710²³–25 October 1760) and Elizabeth Tonge. (The International Genealogical Index has a Samuel, with father Guy, christened at Pontefract, 19 March 1747 (Batch J009643), who could possibly be Samuel Medley (1738–99), but see below.)

Career I

According to Sarah Medley,²⁴ he was 'Born at Cheshunt ... [and] Educated under his grandfather Mr William Tonge of Enfield, a man of considerable learning and great respectability in the religious world.' He was 'bound apprentice to an oilman in Newgate Street' (1752) and 'From this sphere of action, so wholly repulsive to his genius, he ... determined to free himself and 'with breaking out of war in 1755' he was able to serve out his time in the navy. Thus, he 'became free of the cloth-workers company'. 'His two brothers were also at this time in the seafaring line.' He was a midshipman on the *Buckingham* (74 guns), then master's mate on the *Intrepid* under Admiral Boscawen; he was stationed for more than three years in the Mediterranean, where he was involved in several actions with the enemy, and finally off Cape Lagos. On 18 August 1759: 'The station which Mr Medley occupied ... was on the poop ... where a table and chair was placed for him to take minutes of the momentous process. However he had part of the calf of his leg shot off and was invalided home to Grandfather Tonge who had then retired and left Enfield.' He was baptized at 'the church in Eagle-Street ... under Dr Gifford' in December 1760. He 'commenced a school in ... Seven Dials London'.

Marriage

He married Mary Gill, daughter of William Gill, wholesale hosier of Nottingham, on 17 April 1762. (The marriage licence dated 16 April 1762 is available via www.Englishorigins.com.)

Career II

His daughter told us that he then 'removed to King-Street Soho' where he ran 'a large and flourishing school' (1762–66). He was 'called to the ministry' on 29 August 1766 in London and was ordained on 13 July 1768 at the Baptist church, Watford, Herts. (*The Victoria County History of Hertfordshire*, II, p. 293 states that: 'A new (Baptist) church was formed by Samuel Medley of Liverpool who came to reside at Watford in 1768'.) According to Sarah, he 'took charge of the church and established a respectable boarding school there' (in Watford). He was invited to Liverpool on 11 November 1771, took up office there on 15 April 1772, and built up the church and his own reputation.

Issue

Samuel 1769; Elizabeth; Arthur; Mary; Sarah, 1772; Rebecca; Margaret; Lydia; Deborah (as shown in his Will, available through the Family Records Centre). 'My dear B—' of his poem, published in Sarah's *Memoirs*,²⁵ 'To a daughter on the birth of her first child' (evidently a boy) may be Rebecca (i.e. Becky). The Reverend Samuel Medley himself wrote: 'The Spiritual merchant described ... A sermon preached ... 1777', London, 1778; 'Hymns. The public worship and private devotions of true Christians assisted', London, 1789, of which there were subsequent editions – for example, 1790 (enlarged), 1800 (new edition), and 1839 (another new edition).²⁶ He also provoked others to go to print, notably J. Edwards, *Letters to the Rev Mr Medley*; D. R. (Richard de Courcy), *A letter to a Baptist Minister*.

Medley, Guy (c.1740?–1765)

Son of Guy Medley (1692²⁷ or c.1710²⁸–25 October 1760) and Elizabeth Tonge. Lost at sea near Halifax, December 1765.²⁹

Medley, William Tonge (1736–60)

Son of Guy Medley (1692³⁰ or c.1710³¹–25 October 1760) and Elizabeth Tonge. Shipwrecked in the *Fanny* off Portland Place on 23 February 1760.³²

Medley, Samuel (1769–1857)³³

Origin

Son of Samuel Medley (1738–99) and Mary Gill.

First marriage

Susannah Bowley of London in 1792.

*Issue*³⁴

Susannah 1793; Lydia 1796; William 1801; George Bowley 1802; Guy 1803; Mary Margaret 1804.

Second marriage

To Elizabeth Smallshaw of Liverpool in 1818.

Career

Painter (RA exhibitor – religious subjects and portraiture); from 1805 a member of the stock exchange; an active Baptist; involved in the foundation of University College; latterly resident at Chatham (Pigot's 1840, Chatham, Brompton & Gillingham, lists a Samuel Medley, under Gentry & Clergy, at Hampton House). Author of *Memoirs of the late Rev. Samuel Medley, compiled by his son ...*, J. Johnson, London, 1800.

APPENDIX 2

Medley, Sarah (1768–1834)³⁵

Origin

Daughter of Samuel Medley (1738–99) and Mary Gill.

Career

Authoress of *Memoirs of Samuel Medley former Minister of the Baptist Chapel in Liverpool ... to which are added selections from his posthumous writings, in prose and verse.* (Hymns composed by Samuel Medley. Adapted to sacramental occasions, Liverpool, 1833.) These memoirs were published 'from a conviction of their superior information as compared with the hasty performance of the former Editor' (namely her brother). The preface includes: 'Mr Medley of London no doubt has done what he could and by large insertions from manuscript reminiscences of our sapient ancestors ... and by ... appendage of two long sermons ... and ... a melange of poetry, rhymes, etc. by no means suffering from too nice selection, or refinement of correctness ... filled ... 350 pages, without intruding on those provinces where I walk at large with the delightful guardians of legitimate biography ... and instruction dictating by my side'— and she also objected to editing of the hymns. She also wrote *Original poems, sacred and miscellaneous*, Liverpool, 1807. She mentions in this work that she is 'surrounded with the beautiful scenery of the neighbouring village of Runcorn'. She then wrote *The visitor's descriptive guide to Leamington Spa, Warwick, and the adjacent towns and villages*, Warwick, 1826, 'blending correct information with poetical embellishment', as she claims. The title page also has: 'author of *The Beauties of Leamington*'.

DESCENT TO THE PRESENT DAY

The granddaughter of Samuel Medley (1769–1857), Amelia Cerf Costin, née Medley (1831–86), was great great grandmother of the author Nigel Webb.

Appendix 3

Currencies and their value

In embassy and Levant Company communications, the currency used is the English pound (£) or the dollar (\$).

The Levant Company's unit of account is the European dollar or lion dollar (a debased form of the Dutch dollar with the lion of Zealand on it). The Germans and Italians made imitations with lower silver content.¹

According to Lord Kinnoull, the exchange rate in 1735 was represented by \$24,000 = £3500, that is £1 = \$6.857 or 1 dollar = £0.1458 = 2s.11d.

Here are some examples of costs, drawn from Chapter 2 unless footnotes say otherwise:

A cane chair	11s.8d ²
Cost of a cow in England in 1737	£4.3s.0d ³
Expenses charged for entertainment on king's birthday 1732	£34
Gold watch and chain for the Dragoman of the Porte	£45
Cost of quarantine at Marseilles for Kinnoull's party	£100 ⁴
Annual salary of Levant Company chaplain	£115
Annual salary of Kinnoull's secretary Sandys (lower end of estimate)	£300
Cost of using French ship for Kinnoull's party from Constantinople to Marseilles ⁵	£300
For mourning goods on Queen's death	£440
Kinnoull's (unsuccessful) request for annual allowance for intelligence gathering	£500
Cost of Fawkener's party's journey home	£800
Approximate annual payments by Levant Company to Kinnoull for entertainment	£1200
Borrowed by Kinnoull from the Swedes to pay off debts on leaving	£1625 ⁶
Stanyan's or Kinnoull's annual salary plus gratuity	£1700
French ambassador's (supposed) annual salary	£5000

Samuel Medley uses the Turkish coin, which he writes as the Peraw. Marsigli⁷ writes this currency as Para and gives 1 Para = 3 Aspri (elsewhere anglicized to aspers) and 120 Aspri = 1 Leon, that is one lion dollar.

Thus he has 40 Para = 1 Leon, that is 40 Peraw = one dollar, and, as we shall see below, this is in line with Medley's usage. It follows that £1 = \$6.857 = 6.857 x 40

APPENDIX 3

Peraws, that is £1 = 274 Peraws = 823 Aspri. Inalcik⁸ writes Aspri as akce, abbreviated to ak and has 120 akce = 1 kurus or 1 k, namely 1 dollar. He rates £1 sterling, in 1736, as equivalent to up to 7 k, that is 840 ak, and this ties in with Kinnoull's and Marsigli's figure, read together, of 823 Aspri.

Let us now look at Samuel Medley's various entries involving currency. First we will convert to English currency.

Opposite 21 October 1733

Memdm that y^e Smale Change at portugall is Copper w^{ch} they call vinting – viz 20 Roys – the peny at Leghorn is calld a gratch at Genoa – a poppioll – at port mohoun tis call a doublet – at turky tis calld a peraw.

None of the currencies here need concern us except the peraw; he is right to regard a peraw as a penny, however, because 1 Peraw = £(1/274) = 0.88d, very nearly a penny. Here he is again with the same reasonable approximation:

Opposite 27 December 1734

If they offer their cupp (w^{ch} Is Copper linnd) about a pint – if it be any one of fashion – they Expect you give then a peraw w^{ch} is a peny and this is one kind of way of Begging.

It follows then that when, on 30 October 1733, he 'pd Tomazo all off for Washing' and found that he had '30 peraws over', the excess was around 2s 2½d.

Then, on 17 June 1734, we have 'y^e Indian merchant give me 2 zelots.' According to Bosscha Erdbrink,⁹ in 1731 '1 new zloty = 90 aqce, i.e. 90 aspri.' So 2 zelots = 180 aspri = 60 peraws = £(60/274) which is about 4s.4½d. (But why did the Indian merchant give him this sum?)

Medley received various payments from Lord Kinnoull:

17 June 1734

Tuesday Rec'd fifteen Doller of my L^d on acc' ... [i.e. 15 x £0.1458 = £2: 3s 9d.]

2 December 1734

Rd 10 dollors of my L^d [10 x £0.1458 = £1.9s.2d].

15 December 1734

I Rec'd this Morning twenty Venetian Zequeens of My L^d.

According to Marsigli,¹⁰ 300 Aspri = 1 Zecchino,¹¹ that is 1 Zequeen. So twenty Venetian Zequeens = 6000 Aspri = 2000 Peraws = 50 dollars = £7.5s.10d.

Let us now look at Medley's loan to the baker:

april 6th 1734 [in fact 1735]

Lent the Baker (our Steward

as wee call him) a peice of Gould

110 peraws

april 20 Lent him two nesaloots –

62 p-s

THE EARL AND HIS BUTLER IN CONSTANTINOPLE

May the 3d to halfe a Glosster Cheese forty Six peraws –	46 p-s
Recd one dollr	5 dollor 18 p-s

It is not clear what the ‘peice of Gould’ might be but the Turks used the Hungarian Serif and 110 Peraws = 330 aspri. Marsigli¹² gives 260 aspri as the value of the Ungaro Seriffo in 1732, while Inalcik values it at 3k 20ak = 380 akce, that is 380 aspri in 1736. Probably, then, it was a Serif.

‘Two nesaloots’ is presumably two new zloty = 180 aspri = 60 peraws, as above. The total bill then adds up to 110 + 62 + 46 = 218 peraws and if we take 40 peraws = 1 dollar as above, we obtain Medley’s total of 5 dollors 18 peraws.

The ‘halfe a Glosster Cheese’ was valued at 46 peraws, which converts to 3s.4d. In pounds, shillings and pence the account would be something like the following:

Lent the Baker (our Steward as wee call him)	£ s d
a peice of Gould	8 0
april 20 Lent him two nesaloots –	4 6
May the 3d to halfe a Glosster Cheese	3 4
Recd one dollr	15 10
Recd	3 0

Other currencies to which reference is made in the text of this book are as follows: the Venetian ducat, which was worth 385 aspri¹³ = 128 peraws = £(128/274) = about 9s. The sequin = Medley’s Zequeen = zechino of Venice; 100 zechini was worth about £34 (as shown above). The piaster or piastre, which Dearborn¹⁴ equates to the (Grouch or) Dollar, is 1 piastre = 40 paras.

It is tempting to try to understand these figures in terms of today’s currencies, but that is unfortunately an unrealistic ambition. We cannot do better, in summarizing this situation, than to quote John Carswell:

It would be meaningless and unhistorical to give a multiplier for a currency of three centuries ago to provide its purchasing power in today’s sterling. The societies in which each functioned differ too much in social structure and in the range of goods and services available. The governors of the Bristol workhouse in 1714 were able to provide a good diet for the inmates for 16d (7p) a day, including regular meat and beer. So one can only offer examples. Staple foods were cheap, but manufactured goods were dear. All imports were expensive. Tea, for instance, was £1 a pound, but a loaf was less than a hundredth of that. Clothes were very expensive, and so were books. A manservant would be well-paid at £10 a year over and above board, lodging, uniform and tips: for a woman servant it would be £5. A middle-class family with £200 a year would be very comfortable, and many clergy had to keep up appearances with considerably less. £500 a year would be wealth. The nearest thing to a multi-millionaire of 1992 would have been ‘a man worth a plumb’ — a ‘plumb’ being current slang for £100,000. But of course even men so rich as this could not possess a car, a television, or even a telephone.¹⁵

Notes

Abbreviations

BL = The British Library; CUL = Cambridge University Library; HALS = Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies; HMSO = His/Her Majesty's Stationery Office; NAS = National Archives of Scotland; NLS = National Library of Scotland; TNA = The National Archives (TNA) formerly the Public Record Office (PRO); YAS = Yorkshire Archaeological Society

Introduction

1. J. Hecht, *The Domestic Servant Class in the Eighteenth Century*, Routledge, London, 1956, pp. 216–17.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 50–1.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
4. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 24 July 1730 (TNA) SP 97/26/102–5.
5. See Appendix 2.
6. Part of a family tree is given in Appendix 2.
7. Notes on people and places referred to in quotations from Medley's diary are given in, respectively, Appendix 1 and the Glossary.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
9. See Appendix 2.
10. Samuel Medley, *Memoirs of the late Rev. Samuel Medley, Compiled by his Son*, J. Johnson, London, 1800.
11. See Appendix 2.
12. Sarah Medley, *Memoirs of Samuel Medley formerly Minister of the Baptist chapel in Liverpool*, J. Jones, Liverpool, 1833.

Chapter 1

1. *Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts: Portland Manuscripts (Harley papers)* 10 vols, HMSO, London, 1891–1931, vol. 6, p. 119.
2. Lady Abigail Dupplin to Sir Patrick Murray, 3 April 1711 and 8 May 1711, NLS MS.21101, ff. 19, 23.
3. Lady Abigail Dupplin to William Stratford, 7 September 1713, BL Add 70419.
4. *The House of Commons 1690–1715*, Cambridge University Press for the History of Parliament Trust, 2002: see the section on George Hay.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Bromley to Sir Robert Harley, 11 August 1711, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1899, vol. 5.
7. Stratford to Edward Harley, 1 November 1714, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1901, vol. VII.

NOTES (CHAPTER 1, PP. 2–6)

8. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004, p. 1016.
9. Dupplin to Lord Foley, 24 December 1715, BL Add 38507/183.
10. Lady Abigail Dupplin (later Kinnoull) to her aunt Abigail Harley, 4 February 1717, BL Add 70147.
11. Lady Abigail Dupplin (later Kinnoull) to her aunt Abigail Harley, 28 July 1716, BL Add 70147.
12. *Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts: Calendar of the manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath*, HMSO, London, 1904–, vol. 3: *The Prior papers*, pp. 453–5, 457, 459, 477.
13. Lady Abigail Kinnoull to her brother Edward Harley, 5 October 1719, BL Add 4291/238.
14. Lady Abigail Kinnoull to Abigail Harley, 11 January 1721, BL Add 7014.
15. *The House of Commons 1690–1715*, Cambridge University Press for the History of Parliament Trust, 2002. See the section on George Hay.
16. Kinnoull to Sir Robert Harley, 18 June 1720, BL Add 70241/868A.
17. Royal Bank of Scotland Archives, GB 1502/DR/427/1/140.
18. Clelland to Lord Grange, 17 August 1720, NAS GD124/15/1208.
19. Stratford to Edward Harley, 6 January 1721, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1901, vol. 7.
20. Stratford to Edward Harley, 17 November 1712, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1901, vol. 7.
21. Lady Abigail Kinnoull to Sir Robert Harley, 29 March 1720, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1899, vol. 5.
22. Kinnoull to Sir Robert Harley, 21 March 1721, BL Add 70241/868A.
23. Sir Robert Harley to Edward Harley, 21 July 1721, BL Add 70383/51 and 11 August 1721, BL Add 70383/60.
24. Royal Bank of Scotland Archives GB 1502/DR/427/2 and 3.
25. Stratford to Edward Harley, 12 December 1721, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1901, vol. 7.
26. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004, p. 997.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 1016.
28. Lady Abigail Kinnoull to Abigail Harley, 13 August 1723, BL Add 70147.
29. Lady Abigail Kinnoull to Sir Patrick Murray, 13 October 1730, NLS MS.21101, ff. 169–72.
30. Royal Bank of Scotland Archives GB 1502/DR/427/1, 2 and 3.
31. William Drummond to Mr Fletcher of Saltoun, 19 January 1724, NLS MS16529/164; a case involving Kinnoull and Archibald, Earl of Hay, c.22 January 1724, MS17610/13–32; bond of corroboration, 11 March 1724, NLS MS17610/34–36; William Drummond to Mr Fletcher, May 1724, NLS MS16529/166. The debts involved Sir Alex Gilmour, Sir James Rothead and Archibald, Earl of Hay. It is not easy to see, from the correspondence exactly who owed how much to whom.
32. Lady Abigail Kinnoull to Abigail Harley, 12 December 1723, BL Add 70147.
33. Stratford to Edward Harley, 17 October 1724, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1901, vol. 7.
34. Kinnoull to Sir Patrick Murray, 21 May 1724, NLS MS.21101, f. 130.
35. Stratford to Edward Harley, 17 May 1726, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1901, vol. 7.
36. Dupplin to Sir Patrick Murray, 7 October 1713, NLS MS.21101, f. 42.

NOTES (CHAPTER 1, PP. 6–14)

37. Lady Abigail Kinnoull to Sir Patrick Murray, 10 November 1726, NLS MS.21101, f.142.
38. NLS MS.21101, ff. 152–3.
39. Abigail Harley to Edward Harley, letters 148, 172, 174, January to April 1726, BL Add 700379/869C.
40. Stratford to Edward Harley, 14 July 1725, BL Add 70417/77.
41. Stratford to Edward Harley, 2 December 1726, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1901, vol. 7.
42. Stratford to Edward Harley, 20 June 1726 and 8 April 1728, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., 1901, vol. 7.
43. Drummond to Sir Patrick Murray, 7 July 1729, NLS MS.21101, ff. 52–3. In fact Dupplin was back in England by early 1731.
44. See various letters in YAS DD132/2/10, bundles 7 and 9.
45. The authors are indebted to Dr Ruth Paley for this information on the Duke of Devonshire.
46. Kinnoull to Horace Walpole, 24 December 1735, BL Add 73985.
47. Horace Walpole to Kinnoull, 20 November 1734, BL Add 23792/278.
48. Kinnoull to Sir Patrick Murray, 9 November 1729, NLS MS.21101, ff. 58–61.
49. Stratford to Edward Harley, 28 September 1728, BL Add MS70418.
50. William Drummond to Sir Patrick Murray, 7 July 1729, NLS MS.21101, ff. 52–3.
51. For more details on the Levant Company's role in the ambassador's appointment, see *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3.
52. Kinnoull to Sir Patrick Murray, 9 November 1729, NLS MS.21101, ff. 58–61.
53. Sandys to Delafaye, 4 May 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
54. (TNA) ADM 51/1004.
55. C. de Saussure, *Lettres de Turquie, 1730–39*, Budapest, 1909, pp. 85 *et seq.* This appears to be Old Style dating; his and Sandys' dates agree during the voyage.
56. (TNA) ADM 51/1004.
57. The full data, kindly supplied by Douglas McCarthy, picture librarian, National Maritime Museum, is as follows: *Charles Galley*: 5th rate 32, 546 bm. 131 x 281½ ft, Woolwich Dockyard 1676. Rebuilt 1693 as 548bm. Rebuilt at Deptford in 1710 as 537bm. Renamed *Torrington* July 1729 and rebuilt as 594bm. Hulk 1740. Sold 12 July 1744.
58. Sandys to Delafaye, 4 May 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
59. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 14 December 1729 (TNA) SP97/25.
60. Sandys to Delafaye, 4 May 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
61. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 3/14 January 1729/30 (*sic*) (TNA) SP97/26.
62. Dupplin to the Countess of Oxford, 14 January 1730 (but dated 1729) BL Add 70434.
63. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 3/14 January 1729/30 (*sic*) (TNA) SP97/26.
64. Sandys to Delafaye, 4 May 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
65. *Ibid.*
66. C. de Saussure, op. cit., p. 89 *et seq.*
67. Kinnoull gives 25 April, using the New Style. Captain Vincent, de Saussure and Stanyan, the outgoing British ambassador, report the date of arrival as 14 April.
68. C. de Saussure, op. cit., p. 89 *et seq.*
69. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 31 March 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
70. (TNA) ADM 36/4286.

71. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 24 July 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
72. J. Butt (ed.) *The poems of Alexander Pope*, Twickenham edition Methuen 1939–, vol. 4, Imitations of Horace, Ep.1 vi, line 121.
73. Walpole to Mann, 15 November 1742, from *Letters*, ed. Toynbee p. 308; quoted by Butt, op. cit., p. 375.
74. (TNA) ADM 36/4286.

Chapter 2

1. P. Mansel, *Constantinople, City of the world's desire, 1453–1924*, Penguin, 1995, p. 186.
2. de Saussure, op. cit., letter I, p 90. De Saussure went to lodge with this 'horloger et négociant Genevois'.
3. M. de Guys, *Sentimental journey through Greece: in a series of letters written from Constantinople*, T. Cadell, London, 1773, vol. 1, p. 10.
4. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, *Letters from the Levant ... embassy to Constantinople 1716–18* (J. Rickerby, London, 1838) Arno Press, New York, 1971, pp. 166–7.
5. P. Rycaut, *The present state of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1668) New York, 1971, p. 91.
6. A. Hill, *A full & just account of the present state of the Ottoman Empire* (2nd edn) London, 1710, p. 76.
7. W. B. Stanford et al. (ed.) *The Travels of Lord Charlemont in Greece and Turkey 1749*, Trigraph, London, 1985, p. 176.
8. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 13 December 1732 (TNA) SP 97/26.
9. Bodleian Library, Oxford University, MS. Don. d. 193, fols. 2v–5r.
10. Ibid.
11. D. Cantemir, *History of the growth and decay of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1734/7): extracts, ed. A. Dutu et al., Bucharest, 1973, p. 60.
12. A. C. Wood, *History of the Levant Company*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1935, pp. 228–30.
13. Wortley Montagu, op cit, p. 214.
14. Ibid., p. 176.
15. A. Pallis, *In the days of the Janissaries*, Hutchinson, London, 1951, pp. 87–9.
16. Notes on people and places referred to in quotations from Medley's diary are given in, respectively, Appendix 1 and the Glossary.
17. F. M. Gocek, *East encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1987, p. 42.
18. Wortley Montagu, op. cit., p. 113.
19. Mansel, op. cit., p. 194.
20. (TNA) SP97/25.
21. Memorial from the Levant Company to the King, 8 June 1726 (TNA) SP97/25. See Appendix 3 for notes on exchange rates.
22. Levant Company Chancery register from the Constantinople Factory, 2 October 1732 (TNA) SP102/182.
23. Mansel, op. cit., p. 194.
24. D. Bull et al., *The ambassador, the sultan and the artist*, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, 2003.
25. Ibid., p. 40.
26. M. L. Shay, *The Ottoman Empire from 1720 to 1734 as revealed in despatches of the Venetian Baili*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1944, p. 38.

NOTES (CHAPTER 2, PP. 22–34)

27. M. A. Cook, *A history of the Ottoman Empire to 1730*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1976, Chapter 7, p. 219. For more information on the 1730 rebellion, see sections on *Diplomatic matters* and *Turkish affairs* in Chapter 3.
28. See section below entitled *Belgrade village*.
29. Kinnoull to Robinson, 13 January 1733, BL Add 23787/37,116.
30. M. de Guys, op. cit., vol. 3, pp. 142–205. The Comte de Bonneval was a Frenchman employed by the Ottoman government. See *Diplomatic matters* in Chapter 3.
31. Levant Company account book for Constantinople, entry for 22 March 1731 (among others) (TNA) SP105/202.
32. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 19 August 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/119.
33. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 13 December 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/319–25.
34. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 13 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/332–7.
35. Or possibly 30 July.
36. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 6 August 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/236–42.
37. Bull et al., op. cit., p. 11.
38. Wortley Montagu, op. cit., p. 194.
39. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 13 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/332–7.
40. Calkoen to the States General, 5 October 1734, BL Add 23792/180. It is not clear if he was using the New Style or the Old Style of dating. In any case, Medley's date of observation is uncertain.
41. Diary, opposite entry for 6 September 1734.
42. Wortley Montagu, op. cit., p. 180.
43. Levant Company account book for Constantinople (TNA) SP 105/202.
44. Account book for Levant Company at Constantinople, 1 December 1730–31 May 1731 (TNA) SP 105/202.
45. Samuel Medley's diary, 13 April 1734.
46. Wood, *History*, p. 233.
47. See Chapter 5.1, *At His Excellency's service*, for many examples.
48. C. de Saussure, op. cit., Letter 14, 26 March 1733, p. 97.
49. *Nature medicine*, July 1996, vol. 2, no. 7, p. 821, in a review of C. V. Ford's book *Lies! Lies!! Lies!!! The psychology of deceit*, American Psychiatric Press, Washington, 1995.
50. *The European Lawyer*, July/August 2004.
51. R. A. Chaudri, *Muslim festivals and ceremonies*, London Mosque, London, 1984, p. 31.
52. Relandus, *De Religione Mohammedica libri duo*, Ultrajecti (Broedelet) 1705.
53. H. Prideaux, *The true nature of imposture fully display'd in the life of Mahomet*, London, 1697.
54. Diary, 25 January 1734.
55. W. B. Stanford et al., op. cit., p. 222.
56. Wortley Montagu, op. cit., p. 211.
57. Stanyan to Newcastle, 27 December 1726 (TNA) SP 97/25.
58. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 19 August 1730 (TNA) SP 97/26.
59. Dupplin (from Lisbon) to the Countess of Oxford, 14 January 1730, BL Add 70434.
60. A. Vandal, *Une ambassade française en Orient sous Louis XV: la mission du Marquis de Villeneuve 1728–41*, Paris, 1887.
61. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 13 September 1730 (TNA) SP/97/26/146.
62. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/174–84.

63. Robert Barton to Kinnoull, 16 May 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/244.
64. Wortley Montagu, *op. cit.*, p. 223.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
66. Vandal, *op. cit.*, pp. 251–3.

Chapter 3

1. Levant Company to Stanyan, 26 September 1729 (TNA) SP105/117.
2. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 4 May 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/44–7.
3. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 May 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/50, 74–9.
4. Sandys to Delafaye, 16 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/202–4.
5. The most important of the British merchants.
6. Log of the *Torrington* (TNA) ADM 51/1004.
7. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 29 June 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/64–73.
8. Stanyan to Newcastle, 27 May 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/52; Bodleian MS.Don.c.182/1–12.
9. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 29 June 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/64–73.
10. See *A Swedish sideshow* in Chapter 4 for further details of the manoeuvres leading to the granting of this permission.
11. P. Mansel, *op. cit.*, p. 155.
12. M. Anderson, *Europe in the eighteenth century 1713–1783*, Longmans, London, 1961, p. 153.
13. A. Stiles, *Russia, Poland and the Ottoman Empire, 1725–1800*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1991, p. 56.
14. Mansel, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
15. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 21 May 1733 (TNA) SP 97/26.
16. H. Inalcik and D. Quataert (eds) *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994, p. 728.
17. Mansel, *op. cit.*, p. 192.
18. Wood, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
19. D. B. Horn, *The British Diplomatic Service 1689–1789*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1961, p. 21.
20. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 10 September 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/137.
21. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/174–184.
22. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 10 September 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/137.
23. L. Cassels, *The struggle for the Ottoman Empire, 1717–40*, John Murray, London, 1966.
24. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 13 September 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/143–6.
25. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/174–84.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Robinson to Kinnoull, 6 December 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/193–4.
28. Kinnoull to Robinson, 12 February 1731, BL Add 23795/222.
29. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 February 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/210–11.
30. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/174–84.
31. Stanyan to Newcastle, 3 January 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/4.
32. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 23 April 1731 (TNA) SP 97/26/225–31.
33. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 6 August 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/236–42.
34. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 13 December 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/320.
35. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 19 November 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/259–71; 8 January 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/ 274–9.

NOTES (CHAPTER 3, PP. 48–62)

36. Kinnoull to Robinson, 8 January 1732, BL Add 3784/103–6).
37. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 15 September 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/312–15.
38. Kinnoull to Robinson, 13 January 1733, BL Add 23787/37,116.
39. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 25 January 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/280–7.
40. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 10 May 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/303–7.
41. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 24 March 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/287–300.
42. L. Lockhart, 'Fifteen guns', *Royal Central Asian Society Journal*, vol. 23, part 4, October 1936. The eminent orientalist Laurence Lockhart researched this event thoroughly for this article and we have followed his account and reasoning closely in the rest of this section. The Royal Central Asian Society is now named the Royal Society for Asian Affairs and its journal, called *Asian Affairs*, is published by Taylor & Francis (website: <http://www.tandf.co.uk>) which, together with the society, have kindly given permission for use of the article concerned.
43. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 24 March 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/287–300. All other quotations in this section are from this source also.
44. Stanford et al., op. cit., p. 168.
45. Anderson, op. cit., p. 231.
46. Mansel, op. cit., p.188.
47. Anderson, op. cit., p. 231.
48. Mansel, op. cit., p. 62.
49. Rycaut, op. cit, p. 83.
50. Ibid., p. 91.
51. Wood, *History*, op. cit., p. 23.
52. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 11 August 1733 and 1 December 1733 (TNA) SP97/26.
53. Gocek, op. cit., p. 87.
54. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 29 June 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
55. G. R. Bosscha-Erdbrink, *At the threshold of Felicity: Ottoman–Dutch relations during the embassy of Cornelis Calkoen, 1726–1744*, van Gendt, Amsterdam, 1977, p. 222.
56. Gocek, op cit, pp. 65–75.
57. B. Miller, *Beyond the Sublime Porte: the Grand Seraglio of Stamboul*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1931, p. 125.
58. Vandal, op. cit, p. 87.
59. Levant Company account book for Constantinople (TNA) SP105/202.
60. B. Miller, op. cit, pp. 120–1.
61. Gocek, op cit, p. 77.
62. S. J. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1976, vol. 1, *Empire of the Ghazis*, p. 242.
63. Kinnoull to Newcastle, various dates in July 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/80–93.
64. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 27 September 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/147–53.
65. There is a very full and colourful account of the rebellion, based on a translation from an unidentified source, in C. Perry, *A view of the Levant: particularly Constantinople*, T. Woodward, London, 1743.
66. Rondeau to Harrington, 28 December 1730 (TNA) SP91/11/245–7.
67. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 3 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/172–3.
68. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 February 1731 (TNA) SP 97/26/210–11.
69. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 23 April 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/225–31.
70. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 4 June 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/232–5.
71. Kinnoull to Robinson, 4 June 1731, BL Add 23782/51.

NOTES (CHAPTER 3, PP. 62–9)

72. Rondeau to Harrington, 21 June 1731 (TNA) SP91/12/82–3.
73. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 6 August 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/236–42.
74. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 19 November 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/259–71.
75. See Chapter 4.
76. Mansel, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
77. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 8 June 1734 (TNA) SP97/27.
78. Fawkenor to Newcastle, 22 January 1737 (TNA) SP97/29.
79. J. Porter, *Turkey its history and progress*, Hurst and Blackett, London, 1854, p. 308.
80. Vandal, *op. cit.*, p. 251.
81. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 31 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26.
82. de Saussure, *op. cit.*, p. 93.
83. Namely a Greek of Constantinople; the Greek community was mainly concentrated in the area near the lighthouse (Greek: *phanarion*) on the Golden Horn.
84. G. R. B. Bosscha Erdbrink, *At the threshold of Felicity: Ottoman–Dutch relations during the embassy of Cornelis Calkoen, 1726–1744*, van Gendt, Amsterdam, 1977, p. 127.
85. Shay, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
86. Wood, *History*, *op. cit.*, p. 227.
87. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 31 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/326–31.
88. H. Grenville, *Observations sur l'état actuel de l'Empire Ottoman*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1965, p. xi.
89. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 31 July 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/106–18.
90. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 19 August 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/119.
91. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 29 June 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/64–73.
92. Kinnoull to Robinson, 12 February 1731, BL Add 23795/222.
93. BL Add 23795/222; BL Add 23783/44.
94. Delafaye to Robinson, 4 June 1731, BL Add 23782.
95. Kinnoull to Robinson, 19 November 1731, BL Add 23783/435; Kinnoull to Newcastle, 19 November 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/259–71.
96. Kinnoull to Robinson, 5 May 1731 (probably – the dates do not quite add up) BL Add 23795/404.
97. (TNA) SP105/117.
98. Kinnoull to Robinson, 17 December 1731, BL Add 23783/546.
99. Kinnoull to Robinson, 3 July 1732, BL Add 23788/211.
100. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 13 December 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/319–25.
101. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 31 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/326–31.
102. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 13 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/332–7.
103. Kinnoull to Robinson, 13 January 1733, BL Add 23787/37,116.
104. Wood, *History*, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
105. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
106. Bosscha Erdbrink, *op. cit.*, p. 81.
107. D. B. Horn, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
108. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
109. Lord Kinnoull's curriculum vitae and character are further explored in *Introducing the Earl of Kinnoull* at the beginning of Chapter 1, together with possible reasons for his appointment.
110. Wood, *History*, *op. cit.*, p. 175.
111. See Appendix 3.
112. Memorial from the Levant Company to the King, 8 June 1726 (TNA) SP97/25.

NOTES (CHAPTER 3, PP. 69–75)

113. Stanyan to Newcastle, 26 October 1725, 22 October 1726 and 24 January 1727 (TNA) SP97/25.
114. Kinnoull and Dupplin to Tweeddale, 25 September 1742, NAS GD1/609/2/45.
115. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 February 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/206–9.
116. See Appendix 3.
117. Wood, *History*, op. cit. p. 134.
118. See Chapter 2 *Houses and 'palaces'* for the amounts of wine destroyed during the 1726 embassy fire.
119. D. B. Horn, op. cit., p. 58. See Appendix 3.
120. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 13 December 1732 (TNA) SP97/26.
121. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 13 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/332–7.
122. William Dunster to Cutts Maydwell, 15 April 1731 (TNA) SP105/117.
123. Chancery register of Levant Company from factory in Constantinople, 10 May 1731 (TNA) SP105/182.
124. Levant Company, London to Kinnoull, 16 November 1731 (TNA) SP105/117.
125. Levant Company, London to Jennings, treasurer, Constantinople, 18 November 1735 (TNA) SP105/117.
126. I. Grundy, *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999, pp. 114 and 117.
127. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 24 July 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
128. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 July 1734 (TNA) SP97/27.
129. Fawkener to Newcastle, 10 October 1744 (TNA) SP97/56.
130. Sandys to Delafaye, 4 May 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
131. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 29 June 1730 (TNA) SP97/26.
132. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 30 November 1734 (TNA) SP97/27.
133. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 30 November 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/148.
134. Wood, *History*, op. cit., p. 221.
135. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 13 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26.
136. A. C. Wood, 'The English embassy at Constantinople 1660–1762, *English Historical Review*, vol. 40, 1925, p. 538.
137. Levant Company to Benjamin Barker, treasurer, Constantinople, 22 June 1733 (TNA) SP105/117.
138. See Chapter 5.
139. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 October 1734 (TNA) SP97/27.
140. A. C. Wood, 'The English embassy', op. cit., p. 539.
141. Levant Company account book for Constantinople (TNA) SP105/202.
142. (TNA) SP105/202.
143. Levant Company, London to Kinnoull, 16 November 1731 (TNA) SP105/117.
144. Levant Company, London to Kinnoull, 1 August 1732 (TNA) SP105/117.
145. Levant Company, London to Kinnoull, 22 October 1734 (TNA) SP105/117.
146. Akdes Nimet Kurat (ed.) *The despatches of Sir Robert Sutton, Ambassador in Constantinople 1710–1714*, Royal Historical Society, London, Camden Third Series, vol. 78, 1953, p. 50.
147. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 February 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/206–9.
148. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 October 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/103–10.
149. Shay, op. cit., pp. 51–2.
150. *Ibid*, p. 55.
151. (TNA) SP105/202.

NOTES (CHAPTERS 3 AND 4, PP. 76–86)

152. (TNA) SP105/202.
153. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 10 May 1732 (TNA) SP97/26/303–7.
154. Levant Company, London to Kinnoull, 1 August 1732 (TNA) SP105/117.
155. (TNA) SP110/61, 11 January 1732 *et seq.*
156. Levant Company to Barker, Treasurer in Constantinople, 22 June 1733 (TNA) SP105/117.
157. Levant Company to Barker, 25 April 1734 (TNA) SP105/117.
158. Levant Company to Barker, 14 June 1734 (TNA) SP105/117.
159. Consul at Aleppo to Kinnoull, 10 October 1732 (TNA) SP110/27/34.
160. Kinnoull to Consul at Aleppo, 10 December 1732 (TNA) SP110/27/44–5.

Chapter 4

1. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 11 August 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/376–83.
2. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 1 December 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/403.
3. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 18 February 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/1–5.
4. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 9 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/341–6.
5. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 21 May 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/347–75.
6. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 11 August 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/376–83; Rondeau to Harrington, 21 June 1735, quoting a letter from Kinnoull (TNA) SP91/18/144–6.
7. Harrington to Rondeau, 27 July 1735 and 7 August 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/165–6.
8. Kinnoull to Rondeau, 22 June 1735 and 3 September 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/313–14; SP91/18/263–4.
9. Kinnoull to Rondeau, 15 December 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/480–3.
10. Wood, *History*, op. cit., p. 175.
11. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 23 April 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/225–31; 6 August 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/236–42.
12. D. Ogg, *Europe of the ancien régime*, Fontana, London, 1965.
13. B. Williams, *The Whig supremacy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1962, pp. 206–7.
14. Cassels, op. cit., p. 9.
15. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 9 March 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/341–6.
16. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 16 August 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/390–6.
17. Shay, op. cit., p. 148.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 148.
19. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 21 May 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/358–60.
20. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 20 July 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/372–4.
21. Kinnoull to Robinson, 29 December 1733, BL Add 23790/25–6.
22. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 18 December 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/1–5.
23. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 March 1734 and 27 April 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/6–8, 12–21; (TNA) SP97/56/145–56.
24. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 20 August 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/47–9; BL Add 23792/20.
25. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 8 June 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/28–31.
26. Kinnoull to Robinson, 13 July 1734, BL Add 23791/253.
27. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 July 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/32–4.
28. Minutes of the English Factory at Constantinople, 12 July 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/38–9.
29. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 July 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/32–4.

NOTES (CHAPTER 4, PP. 76–93)

30. *The new Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th edition, H. H. Benton, University of Chicago, 1982.
31. Wild Geese Heritage Museum and Library, Portumna, Co. Galway, <http://indigo.ie/~wildgees/index.htm>, 6 December 2003.
32. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 15 October 1734, BL Add 23792/170.
33. H. Walpole to Robinson, 23 November 1734, BL 23792/283.
34. Kinnoull to Robinson, 11 August 1733, 28 September 1733 and 2 April 1734, BL Add 23789/19; BL Add 23789/193; BL Add 23790/346.
35. Kinnoull to Robinson, 21 April 1733, BL Add 23788/95.
36. Kinnoull to Robinson, 13 July 1734, BL Add 23791/253.
37. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 September 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/51–62.
38. The Grand Vizier to the King of England, September 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/70–90.
39. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 21 September 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/63–9.
40. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 October 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/103–10.
41. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 November 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/140–3.
42. Riso to Crowe, 12 March 1735 (though dated 1734) (TNA) SP97/27/245–6.
43. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 16 May 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/260–7.
44. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 October 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/103–10.
45. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 8 October 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/97–101; BL Add 23792/140–9.
46. R. Wills, *The Jacobites and Russia 1715–1750*, Tuckwell Press, East Linton, 2002, pp. 143–9.
47. B. Williams, op. cit., pp. 206–7.
48. Shaw, op. cit., pp. 244–5.
49. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 2 April 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/26.
50. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 24 July 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/96.
51. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 20 August 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/42–4.
52. *Svenskt Biografiskt Lexicon*, Stockholm, 1971–3, Band 19, p. 726.
53. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 30 November 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/148–58.
54. H. Danielson, *Sverige och Frankrike 1727–1735, et bidrag till belysning av Arvid Horns utrikespolitik*, Lund, 1920, pp. 256–7, 266.
55. A. M. Wilson, *French foreign policy during the administration of Cardinal Fleury, 1726–43*, Harvard Historical Studies 40, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1936, p. 246, note 19.
56. Danielson, op. cit., p. 258.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 258 and note 12, in which he quotes from a letter from Villeneuve to Chauvelin, 13 July 1734.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 259.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 263.
60. Wilson, op. cit., p. 246, note 19.
61. P. S. Fritz, *The English ministers and Jacobitism between the rebellions of 1715 and 1745*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1975.
62. Rondeau to Harrington, 18 January 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/32–38, 67–8.
63. Harrington to Rondeau, 15 February 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/38–9.
64. Finch to Harrington, 4 December 1734, quoted in Harrington to Rondeau, 15 February 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/38–9.
65. Finch to Harrington, 11 December 1734, quoted in Harrington to Rondeau, 15 February 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/38–9.

NOTES (CHAPTER 4, PP. 93–100)

66. Finch to Harrington, 25 December 1734, quoted in Harrington to Rondeau, 15 February 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/38–9.
67. Finch to Harrington, 12 March 1735, quoted in Harrington to Rondeau, 15 February 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/38–9.
68. *Svenskt Biografiskt Lexikon*, Stockholm, 1971–3, vol. 19, pp. 726–7; vol. 4, pp. 433–4.
69. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 3 May 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/268–72; BL Add 23793/333.
70. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 2 August 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/334–43.
71. Observations of the Levant Company upon Mr Tigh's letters in 'Ye commissioners for Trade and Plantations' to Lord Harrington, 2 November 1736 (TNA) SP97/56/195–6.
72. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 7 July 1730 (TNA) 97/26/84.
73. A. Hamilton et al. (eds) *Friends and rivals in the East*, Brill, Leiden, 2000, p. 237.
74. Muster role of HMS *Torrington* (TNA) ADM 36/4287.
75. Kinnoull to Newcastle, June/July 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/84, 111–18.
76. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 19 August 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/119.
77. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 29 June 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/64–73.
78. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 10 September 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/133–5.
79. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 February 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/206–9.
80. Levant Company London to Kinnoull, 27 August 1731 (TNA) SP105/117.
81. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 19 November 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/259–71.
82. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 20 February 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/194–206.
83. Hamilton et al. (eds), op. cit., p. 237.
84. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 July 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/32–4.
85. Pisani to Kinnoull, 8 July 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/361.
86. Levant Company to Kinnoull, 22 October 1734 (TNA) SP105/117.
87. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 20 February 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/194–206.
88. Kinnoull to Barker, Levant Company (TNA) SP97/27/210–11.
89. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 October 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/103–10.
90. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/174–84.
91. HMS *Torrington* muster role, 18 October 1729 (TNA) ADM 36/4286.
92. de Saussure, op. cit., Letter 8, p. 98.
93. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/174–84.
94. Sandys to Delafaye, 16 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/202–4.
95. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 February 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/206–11.
96. Levant Company, London to Kinnoull, 16 June 1732 (TNA) SP105/117.
97. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 13 October 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/113–22.
98. Newcastle to Waldegrave, 23 May 1734, BL Add 23791.
99. H. Walpole to Kinnoull, 20 November 1734, BL 23792/278.
100. Bosscha Erdbrink, op. cit., p. 101.
101. H. Walpole to Kinnoull, 20 November 1734, BL Add 23792/278.
102. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 1 November 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/135–8.
103. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 11 November 1734 and 19 November 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/144–5; BL Add 23792/299.
104. Harrington to Robinson, 29 October 1734, BL Add 23792/235.
105. Rondeau to Harrington, 23 November 1734 (TNA) SP91/17/148–50.
106. H. Walpole to Robinson, 12 October 1734, BL Add 23792/126.
107. Rondeau to Harrington, 30 November 1734 (TNA) SP91/17/154–7.

108. Neplyuev's account of 17 October 1734, enclosed (in translation) with Rondeau to Harrington, 30 November 1734 (TNA) SP91/17/158–61.
109. Vandal, *op. cit.*, p. 239.
110. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 24 January 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/169–80. The two dining engagements mentioned do not clearly tie up with entries in Medley's diary.
111. Calkoen to Fagel, 28 February 1735, Nationaal Archief, Den Haag: Staten Generaal 1550–1796, Inv.nr.7003.
112. Calkoen to Kinnoull and Kinnoull to Calkoen, 29 January 1735–9 February 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/183–93.
113. Calkoen to Fagel, 28 February 1735, Nationaal Archief, Den Haag: Staten Generaal 1550–1796, Inv.nr.7003.
114. The entry is that for 29 May, referring to the night of 28, which is equivalent to 8 June New Style dating.
115. de Saussure to Calkoen, 13(?) February 1735, Nationaal Archief, Den Haag: Staten Generaal 1550–1796, Inv.nr.7003. *'Je ne suis pas embarrassé a deviner d'ou part ce coup, ne doutant point quil ne vienne d'une maison, ou nous avons eu luy et moy demeuré, et ou sont logés la violence l'injustice, la fureur &c.'* (sic)
116. de Saussure to Calkoen, 21 February 1735, Nationaal Archief, Den Haag: Staten Generaal 1550–1796, Inv.nr.7003. *'Je vous seray encore beaucoup plus redevable, si vous voules faire la grace de m'ecrire encore une fois pour m'apprendre ... si l'on sçait les sujets qui l'ont causé, car je ne puis pas m'imaginer que pour des intrigues de femmes on aye poussé les choses si loin.'* (sic)
117. Calkoen to Kinnoull, 3–12 December 1732 (Calkoen's copy) being an enclosure with Calkoen to Fagel, 28 February 1735, Nationaal Archief, Den Haag: Staten Generaal 1550–1796, Inv.nr.7003. *'pour avoir une satisfaction et reparation convenable de la violence qu'une partie de ses gens ont commis à ma Maison de Campagne. J'espere que VE me la donnera d'autant plus solommelle quand elle voudra faire reflexion au Pais ou nous residons, et quelles consequences dangereuses en pourroient resulter, si les Ministres Chretiens memes donnoient des exemples que immunités et franchisessacrées des Maison des Ministres publics pussent être violées impunement.'* (sic)
118. The references to the falcon are included in Calkoen to Fagel, 28 February 1735, Nationaal Archief, Den Haag: Staten Generaal 1550–1796, Inv.nr.7003.
119. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 20 February 1735 (TNA) 97/27/194–206.
120. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 4 March 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/232–56.
121. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 April 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/251–6.
122. Monier to Newcastle, 9 May 1735 (TNA) SP97/60/12–15.
123. Neplyuev to Court, 23 February 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/93–4.
124. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 4 March 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/232–56.
125. Neplyuev to Court, 1 April 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/106–7.
126. Rondeau to Harrington, 12 April 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/85–6.
127. Kinnoull to Robinson, 19 April 1735, BL Add 23793/288.
128. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 16 May 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/260–7; BL Add 23793/59.
129. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 10 July 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/315–24; BL Add 23794/278–85.
130. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 19 August 1735, BL Add 23795/131.
131. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 2 August 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/334–43; BL Add 23795/68–86. Of interest also is Stadnicki to Kinnoull, 2 August 1735, BL Add 23795/78, in which Stadnicki requests help in the *'manifeste violation des droits des Gens'* and a

NOTES (CHAPTER 4, PP. 112–19)

- document dated 30 July 1735, BL Add 23795/82, ‘Memoriale de Residente Russo Vesniacoff alla Fulgida Porta Ottomana’ in support of Stadnicki, also saying that another similar memo has been lodged by ‘Residente Cesareo Signor Tahlman’; also Kinnoull to ‘Il Chehaiah Begh’, 2 August 1735, BL Add 23795/80, in Italian, taking up Stadnicki’s case.
132. Rondeau to Harrington, 13 September 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/245–6.
 133. Harrington to Rondeau, 10 July 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/151–2.
 134. Harrington to Kinnoull, 17 July 1735, BL Add 23794/212.
 135. Harrington to Rondeau, 20 July 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/159–60.
 136. *Oxford dictionary of national biography*, p. 997, quoting Eglinton MSS 257.
 137. D. Szechi, *The Jacobites, Britain and Europe 1688–1788*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1994, p. 93.
 138. Harrington to Robinson, 14 August 1735, BL Add 23795/88–9.
 139. The King to Kinnoull, 22 September 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/392–5.
 140. Kinnoull to Robinson, 27 September 1735, BL Add 23796/68.
 141. Kinnoull to Rondeau, 3 September 1735 (TNA) SP91/18/263–4.
 142. Kinnoull to Harrington, 13 September 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/396–400. Neplyuev’s story confirmed what Thalman had already claimed. See Kinnoull to Newcastle, 19 August 1735, BL Add 23795/98.
 143. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 27 September 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/408–14.
 144. Kinnoull to Robinson, 20 October 1735, BL Add 23796/111.
 145. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 27 September 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/408–14.
 146. Levant Company, London to Luca Chirico, 23 September 1735, SP105/117.
 147. Levant Company, London to Newcastle, 13 January 1736 (TNA) SP105/117.
 148. Kinnoull wrote a good reference for him dated 29 April 1737: ‘Io devo fare la dovuta giustitia al Sigr Luca Chirico come lui in tutti gl’affari Publici e Nazionali nelli quali è stato impegnato alla Porta da tempo in tempo sotto la mia direttione d’essersi sempre comportato con fedeltà e zelo per gl’Interessi di sua Maestà, come delli Corti Imperiale e Russa secondo gli Ordini del Ré com’anco appare per il bon successo. In fede di che mi sottoscrivo Kinnoull.’ (TNA) SP97/56/15–16.
 149. Fawkenor to Newcastle, 30 December 1735, BL Add 23797/25–7.
 150. Fawkenor to Robinson, 22 August 1735, BL Add 23795/143.
 151. Levant Company, London to Kinnoull, 3 September 1735 (TNA) SP105/117.
 152. (TNA) SP105/332/116.
 153. Levant Company, London to Jennings, 3 September 1735 (TNA) SP105/117.
 154. Kinnoull to Sir R. Walpole, 24 January 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/9.
 155. H. Walpole to Kinnoull, 20 November 1734, BL Add 23792/278.
 156. Kinnoull to H. Walpole, 24 December 1735, BL Add 73985.
 157. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 10 February 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/7.
 158. BL Add 61623/8–12b, 22 January 1719.
 159. Fawkenor to Newcastle, 8 May 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/61.
 160. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 8 May 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/63.
 161. Captain Osborne to Kinnoull, 3 May 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/65–6.
 162. Captain Osborne to Kinnoull, 7 May 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/67.
 163. Fawkenor to Newcastle, 1 June 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/67–85.
 164. Fawkenor to Harrington, 11 June 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/122–3.
 165. Rondeau to Harrington, 19 February 1737 (TNA) SP91/21/29–32.
 166. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 16 July 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/141–6.

NOTES (CHAPTER 1, PP. 6–14)

167. Fawkener to Newcastle, 28 August 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/179–80.
168. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 29 August 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/194–6.
169. Fawkener to Stone, 16 September 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/209–10.
170. H. Walpole to Kinnoull, 11 September 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/213–14.
171. H. Walpole to Rondeau, 3 October 1736 (TNA) SP91/20/68–9.
172. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 9 October 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/238–9.
173. Fawkener to Walpole, 23 November 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/250.
174. Fawkener to Newcastle, 24 January 1737 (TNA) SP97/29/33–7.
175. Fawkener to Newcastle, 13 February 1737 (TNA) SP97/29/44–7.
176. Fawkener to Newcastle, 12 May 1737 (TNA) SP97/29/106–18.
177. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 17 June 1737 (TNA) SP97/29/106–18.
178. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 11 July 1737 (TNA) SP97/29/162–3.
179. Kinnoull and Dupplin to Tweeddale, 25 September 1742, NAS GD1/609/2/45.
180. Ibid.
181. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 24 September 1737 (TNA) SP97/29/201–2.
182. Newcastle to Kinnoull, 6 October 1737 (TNA) SP97/29/203.
183. Kinnoull to Sir R. Walpole, 24 December 1737, CUL Ch(H) 2720.
184. Royal Bank of Scotland Archives DR427/17/214.
185. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 4 August 1738, BL Add 32961/284.
186. Swift to Edward Harley, September 1735, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., vol. 6, p. 61.
187. Lady Abigail Kinnoull to Sir Patrick Murray, 13 October 1730, NLS MS.21101, ff. 69–72.
188. YAS DD132/2/10, bundles 7 and 9.
189. See Chapter 2.
190. Kinnoull to Walpole, 24 January 1736 (TNA) SP97/28; Kinnoull to Newcastle, 20 February 1735 (TNA) SP97/27.
191. Earl of Oxford to Jonathan Swift, 30 May 1738, *Portland manuscripts*, op. cit., vol. 6, Letters, 1725–40.
192. Craigie was appointed Lord Advocate in 1742.
193. John Hay, 4th Marquess of Tweeddale.
194. Kinnoull and Dupplin to Tweeddale, 25 August 1742, NAS GD1/609/2/45.
195. Kinnoull to Craigie, 28 October 1752, NAS GD1/609/9/4.
196. Dupplin to Craigie, 6 March 1753, NAS GD1/609/10/1.
197. L. B. Namier, *The structure of politics at the accession of George III*, Macmillan, London, 1929, p. 222.
198. Kinnoull to Lord President, 3 July 1756, NAS GD1/609/11/6.
199. (TNA) PROB 11/839 Image 527/1557; Levant Company Chancery register, SP 105/182.
200. *The Scots peerage founded on Wood's edition of Sir Robert Douglas's peerage of Scotland*, edited by J. B. Paul, Edinburgh, 1908, p. 232.
201. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 17 August 1750, BL Add 32722/183.
202. Lady Margaret Hay to Newcastle, 15 August 1750, BL Add 32722/151.
203. C. Finkel, *Osman's Dream*, John Murray, London, 2005, pp. 329–71.
204. de Saussure, op. cit., p. 165.
205. de Saussure, op. cit., p. 92: 'a cause de sa table qui est d'une longueur tuante, et ou il se fait que trop souvent des excès qui ne sont pas de mon gout.'
206. Fawkener to Newcastle, 1 June 1736 (TNA) SP97/28.

Chapter 5

1. J. Macdonald, *Memoirs of an eighteenth century footman: John Macdonald's travels, 1745–79*, Century, London, 1985.
2. Bridget Hill, *Servants: English Domestic in the Eighteenth Century*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1996, Chapter 12 and p. 237.
3. For instance, see entries for 5 November 1733, 23 November 1733, 18 September 1734, 3 October 1734, 22 April 1735.
4. For instance, see entries for 10 November 1733, 11 November 1733, 25 February 1734, 14 June 1734, 7 November 1734, 28 April 1735, 14 May 1735.
5. For instance, see entries for 27 January 1734, 15 March 1734, 18 May 1734, 2 December 1734, 27 January 1735.
6. For instance, see entries for 7 November 1733, 19 December 1733, 10 March 1734, 30 October 1734, 19 December 1734, 2 January 1735, 3 June 1735.
7. For instance, see entries for 14 November 1733, 16 November 1733, 22 November 1733, 21 December 1733, 24 December 1733, 6 March 1734, 12 April 1734, 7 September 1734, 12 October 1734, 27 October 1734, 31 October 1734, 2 November 1734, 4 November 1734, 6 November 1734, 8 November 1734, 14 November 1734, 26 December 1734.
8. For exchange rates, see Appendix 3.
9. Hecht, *op. cit.*, pp. 47, 51–4.
10. See entries for 20 May 1734, 8 October 1734, 16 January 1735, 30 January 1735, 6 February 1735, 29 May 1735, 10 October 1735, 2 April 1736, 18 April 1736, 30 October 1736.
11. P. Horn, *Flunkeys and scullions*, Sutton Publishing, Stroud, 2004.
12. R. Trumbach, *The rise of the egalitarian family: aristocratic kinship and domestic relations in eighteenth-century England*, Academic Press, London, 1978.
13. (TNA) PROB 11/839, Image 527/1557.
14. Levant Company Chancery register (TNA) SP 105/182.
15. (TNA) PROB 11/934, Image 315/338.
16. (TNA) ADM 36/4286.
17. Calkoen to Fagel, 28 February 1735, Nationaal Archief, Den Haag: Staten Generaal 1550–1796, Inv.nr.7003. See section on *Louis Monier* in Chapter 4.
18. See also diary entries for 14 January 1735, 24 April 1735, 19 June 1735.
19. Levant Company account book for Constantinople (TNA) SP105/202. The costs of these entertainments are discussed in the section on *The Levant Company and the embassy* in Chapter 3.
20. See section on *Louis Monier* in Chapter 4.
21. Hecht, *op. cit.*, p. 50; E. W. Bovill, *English country life, 1780–1830*, Oxford University Press, London, 1962, pp. 94–5.
22. Hecht, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
23. The authors are indebted to Pamela Horn (see note 11) for clearing up this ambiguity.
24. Hecht, *op. cit.*, pp. 40–55, also referring to A. Heasel, *The servants' book of knowledge* (London, 1773) and G. Jacob, *Country gentleman's vademecum* (London, 1717).
25. Hecht., *op. cit.*
26. E. S. Turner, *What the butler saw*, Michael Joseph, London, 1962, p. 28.
27. M. Blundell (ed.) *Blundell's diary and letters book 1702–28*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 1952, p. 105; also B. Hill, *op. cit.*, p. 158.
28. Hecht., *op. cit.*

NOTES (CHAPTER 5, PP. 139–77)

29. Turner, op. cit, p. 53.
30. Hecht, op.cit, quoting P. Finch, *History of Burley-on-the-Hill*, John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, London, 1901.
31. Hecht, op. cit.
32. More precisely, a *giovane di lingua* was a junior dragoman mainly involved in translating written documents.
33. Kinnoull to Robinson, 18 February 1734, BL Add 23790/208–9.
34. Levant Company, London to Stanyan, 16 November 31 (TNA) SP105/117.
35. (TNA) ADM 36/4286.
36. Kinnoull to Delafaye, 19 August 1730 (TNA) SP97/26/119.
37. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 4 June 1731 (TNA) SP 97/26/232–5.
38. Levant Company account book for Constantinople (TNA) SP105/202. See *Mr Brown and the giovani di lingua* in Chapter 5.
39. Levant Company account book for Constantinople (TNA) SP105/202.
40. Levant Company account book for Constantinople (TNA) SP105/202, entry up to 31 May 1731.
41. See Bosscha Erdbrink, op. cit., p. 123
42. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 28 September 1733 (TNA) SP97/26/390–6.
43. Levant Company account book for Constantinople (TNA) SP105/202. See Appendix 3.
44. Vandal, op. cit., p. 115.
45. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 31 January 1733 (TNA) SP97/26.
46. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 20 February 1735 (TNA) SP97/27.
47. The diary entry for 10 February 1735 mentioned the funeral.
48. (TNA) ADM 36/4286.
49. Diary entry for 14 March 1734.
50. de Saussure, op. cit., letter 14, 26 March 1733.
51. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 September 1734 (TNA) SP97/27/51–61.
52. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 12 April 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/251–6.
53. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 3 May 1735 (TNA) SP97/27/268–72.
54. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 January 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/174–84.
55. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 5 February 1731 (TNA) SP97/26/206–9.
56. See Appendix 1 for a biographical note.
57. (TNA) SP105/202.
58. The same ship in which he had sailed in 1732.
59. *St James's Evening Post*, London, 10 November 1733. BL L Burney 297B.
60. Levant Company, Constantinople, account book (TNA) SP105/202); Harrington to Robinson, 25 August 1735, BL Add 23795/98.
61. Levant Company records, 4 February 1734 (TNA) SP105/117.
62. In this connection, the Levant Company, Constantinople, accounts book shows, on 31 January 1734, cash paid to a Sigr Battista Dane by His Excellency's order to defray expenses of recovering equipage of the *Rose*, stranded at Tenedos (at the entrance to the Dardanelles). ((TNA) SP105/202).
63. T. Dover, *The ancient physician's legacy to his country. Being what he has collected himself in forty-nine years' practice ...* (first published 1732) fourth edition, London, 1733, pp. 18 and 22–3 respectively.
64. www.copac.ac.uk 2004.
65. Kinnoull to Newcastle, 29 August 1736 (TNA) SP97/28/194–6.

66. S. N. Zwicker (ed.) *The Cambridge companion to English literature 1650–1740*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, p. xi.
67. S. Gilley and W. J. Sheils, *A history of religion in Britain*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1994.
68. HALS: Delmé Radcliffe collection D/ER/B388.
69. N. Ault (ed.) *Alexander Pope: minor poems*, Methuen, London, 1954: the ‘*Ode on Solitude*’, appears on p. 3.
70. *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*, second edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1956.
71. As in *The Choice*, included in J. Pomfret, *The poetical works of John Pomfret*, Apollo Press, Edinburgh, 1779.
72. See his ‘Upon the divine attributes: a pindaric essay’, in Pomfret, op. cit.
73. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, op. cit., from which the quotations are taken.
74. Pomfret, op. cit.
75. Ibid.; the quoted passages are from the introduction to the poem *Reason*.
76. See Appendix 2.
77. B. Smith and M. Handley, *Brodsworth and Pickburn: a tale of two villages*, Brodsworth and Pickburn Local History Society, Brodsworth, 1996.
78. Fawkenor to Robinson, 10 February 1736, BL Add 23797/193. The same day Kinnoull wrote to ask Robinson to assist Payne with his stay in Vienna, on the way home. Kinnoull to Robinson, 10 February 1736, BL Add 23797/195.

Appendix 1: Biographical notes in relation to the diary and the text

1. For involvement in the Petrie affair, see (TNA) SP97/26/287–300. For Levant Company references see (TNA) SP105/117, SP97/27/38–9.
2. (TNA) SP105/332/167.
3. (TNA) SP105/182, SP105/117, SP97/27/38–9.
4. (TNA) SP105/210/35, SP105/332, SP105/11. He wrote but apparently did not publish ... remarks on ... a voyage to the Euphrates, ... 1698; ... journal of travels through Germany and Italy to Scanderoon ... 1696; ... journal of a voyage from Aleppo to Jerusalem ... 1697. He was the son of Richard Chiswell the elder ‘who well deserves the title of metropolitan bookseller of England, if not the world’ and who was also a publisher of note, publishing, among other things, the 1676 edition of the Speed atlas.
5. (TNA) SP97/26/232–35, SP105/182.
6. (TNA) SP105/182, SP105/202.
7. (TNA) SP105/117, 15 April 1731.
8. (TNA) SP97/26/32–4, 22 April 1730–3 May 1730.
9. (TNA) SP105/117, 23 September 1735.
10. (TNA) SP105/332/147, SP105/210, SP110/26, 28 December 1733 *et seq.*
11. (TNA) SP105/332/116, SP105/210, SP110/26, 28 December 1733 *et seq.*, SP110/27/69–70 and 79; BL Burney 297B, *The Daily Journal*, 8 February 1733. Through Messrs Snelling & Fawkenor he was involved in the Aleppo trade. Particularly from 1736, he was personally (heavily) involved in trading transactions, notably in Cairo cloth – or if only dabbling in it, at the least he had much correspondence about it with which to deal!
12. (TNA) SP105/332/167.
13. (TNA) SP91/18/38–9.

14. (TNA) SP97/26/287–300, SP97/27/38–9, SP105/117, SP105/164, SP105/332/169, SP110/26, 28 December 1733 *et seq.*
15. (TNA) SP97/26/287–300, SP97/27/38–9, SP105/117, SP105/182.
16. (TNA) SP105/332/169, SP110/26.
17. (TNA) SP97/26/287–300, SP97/27/232–56, SP105/117, SP110/26.
18. (TNA) SP11/26,28.
19. (TNA) SP97/26/287–300, SP97/27/38–9, SP105/117, SP105/182, SP105/164, SP105/332/167, SP110/26.
20. (TNA) SP105/117, 4 February 1734.
21. (TNA) SP105/11, SP105/332, SP110/28, SP110/61/60–5, SP110/74; HALS: Delmé Radcliffe Collection D/ER:B226/92, D/ER:B226/93, D/ER B388.
22. BL Add 23785/278.
23. (TNA) SP110/26, 28 December 1733 *et seq.*
24. (TNA) SP105/164, 11 August 1732, 1 March 1734.
25. C. von Burzbach, *Biographisches Lexicon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, Wien, 1881.

Appendix 2: Some members of the Medley family

1. R. C. Medley et al. (eds) *A Medley Omnibus*, 5th edition, 2004, privately printed. The Society of Genealogists has copies of various editions
2. By his own calculations and, independently, according to Medley et al., *op. cit.*
3. Medley, et al., *op. cit.*
4. *Brodsworth Register, Yorkshire Parish Registers* vol. 104, Yorkshire Parish Register Society, 1950.
5. Borthwick Lists and indexes 29, 2001.
6. *Brodsworth Register, Yorkshire Parish Registers* vol. 104, Yorkshire Parish Register Society, 1950.
7. Medley, et al., *op. cit.*
8. Printout kindly supplied to the authors by Pontefract Family History Society.
9. Samuel Medley, *Memoirs of the late Rev. Samuel Medley compiled by his son*, London, 1800.
10. Sarah Medley, *Memoirs of ... Samuel Medley former Minister of the Baptist Chapel in ... Liverpool*, Liverpool, 1833.
11. Medley, et al., *op. cit.*
12. *Hemsworth Register, Yorkshire Parish Registers*, vol. 79, Yorkshire Parish Register Society, 1926, Burials 1759–62, p. 93.
13. Medley, et al., *op. cit.*
14. The International Genealogical Index Ancestral File AFN HQN7–BR.
15. Sarah Medley, *op. cit.*
16. Marriage register of St Mary Lothbury (City of London) on microfilm in the Guildhall library (Refs. Ms.08848 M0023862CL 04350a MS 4346/1; 4346/2) under 1735 (though undated). Medley et al., *op. cit.*, has an earlier marriage to Elizabeth Palmer in 1715 but the authors believe this must be the marriage of another Guy, possibly the son of Hayford Medley (see above) because neither Samuel Medley (1769–1857) nor his sister Sarah mention it in their biographical writings on their grandfather.
17. Medley, et al., *op. cit.*
18. Sarah Medley, *op. cit.*
19. Sarah Medley, *op. cit.*
20. Sarah Medley, *op. cit.* See also Samuel Medley, *op. cit.*
21. Sarah Medley, *op. cit.*

22. Medley et al., op. cit.
23. The International Genealogical Index Ancestral File AFN HQN7–BR.
24. Sarah Medley, op. cit. See also Samuel Medley, op. cit.
25. Sarah Medley, op. cit.
26. Subsequently, there is also Richard Stonelake (ed.) *Twenty-nine unpublished hymns by Samuel Medley (1738–1799)*, Shaftesbury Avenue Publications, London, 1999.
27. Medley et al., op. cit.
28. The International Genealogical Index Ancestral File AFN HQN7–BR.
29. Sarah Medley, op. cit.
30. Medley et al., op. cit.
31. The International Genealogical Index Ancestral File AFN HQN7–BR.
32. Sarah Medley, op. cit.
33. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, and other sources.
34. Medley et al., op. cit.
35. Medley et al., op. cit.

Appendix 3: Currencies and their value

1. A. C. Wood, *History of the Levant Company*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1964.
2. In fact, four dollars. From a list of fire damage at the British embassy in 1725. See (TNA) SP97/25.
3. N. Blundell, *The great diurnal of Nicholas Blundell* (edited by J. J. Bagley), The Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society, n.d., vol. 3, 1720–28. From an inventory of goods on the death of N. Blundell in 1737.
4. See *The new ambassador's arrival and the eventual departure of the old* in Chapter 4.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Comte L. F. de Marsigli, *Stato militare dell'impero ottomano (1732)* Akademische Druck, 1972.
8. H. Inalcik and D. Quataert (eds), *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1914*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
9. Bosscha Erdbrink, op. cit., p. 300 footnote. Dearborn (see footnote 11) agrees with this view. Davis (see footnote 14) gives 1 new zelote = 80 aspers, but the date of this is unclear.
10. Marsigli, op. cit.
11. See also H. Dearborn, *Memoir on commerce and navigation of Black Sea and trade maritime geography of Turkey and Egypt*, Boston, 1819 (vol. 2, pp. 393–414, regarding exchange rates). Dearborn values the Venetian sequin much higher, at about 10 piastres, that 10 dollars, but this is some 15 years earlier.
12. Marsigli, op. cit.
13. Inalcik and Quataert, op. cit., p. 964: exchange rate for 1731; see *Topography and local population* in Chapter 2. Dearborn, op. cit., gives 1 ducat (Naples) = 120 paras.
14. Dearborn, op. cit. See also Davis, *Aleppo and Devonshire Square*, Macmillan, London, 1967 (pp. 189–90). Davis equates the Turkish piastre with the Lion dollar. He refers to F. W. Hasluck, *The Levantine Coinage*, Numismatics Chronicle 5th series, 1, pp. 39–91.
15. J. Carswell, *The South Sea Bubble*, p. xvii.

Bibliography

Bibliography for all sections except Samuel Medley's reading matter. A separate bibliography for Samuel Medley's reading matter can be found on the website www.leginipress.co.uk.

BOOKS, PAPERS AND ARTICLES IN JOURNALS

- Abou-el-Hajj, R. A., *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics*, Istanbul, 1984.
- Formation of the Modern State: The Ottoman Empire*, Albany, 1981
- Adams, S. and S. Adams, *The Complete Servant*, Knight & Lacey, London, 1825.
- Alderson, A. D., *The Structure of the Ottoman Dynasty*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1956.
- Ambrose, G., 'English Traders at Aleppo, 1658–1756', *Economic History Review*, October 1931.
- Anderson, M. S., *Europe in the eighteenth century, 1713–1783*, Longmans, London, 1961.
- Audi, R. (ed.) *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- Ault, N. (ed.) *Alexander Pope: Minor Poems*, Methuen, London, 1954.
- Backhouse, D., 'Tory Tergiversation in the House of Lords, 1714–1760', seminar paper to Institute of Historical Research, Research tools/Projects' archive, 2003. www.history.ac.uk
- Bagley, J. J. (ed.) *The Great Diurnal of Nicholas Blundell*, The Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society, n.d.
- Beal, Mary 'An Ambassador's Reception at the Sublime Porte', *Apollo*, March 1988, pp. 173–9.
- Biograficheski Slovar*, St Peterburg, 1896.
- Burzbach, C. Von (ed.) *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, Wien, 1881.
- Blundell, M. (ed.), *Blundell's Diary and Letters Book 1702–28*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 1952.
- Bona, D. J., *La Conduite au ciel par un ecclésiastique*, nouvelle édition, (translated from Latin), Brussels, 1665.
- Boppe, A., *Les peintres du Bosphore au dix-huitième siècle*, Hachette et cie, Paris, 1911.
- (ed.) *Les peintres du Bosphore au dix-huitième siècle*, Boppe-Vigne & Florenne, ACR, Paris, 1989.
- Bosscha Erdbrink, G. R. B., *At the Threshold of Felicity: Ottoman–Dutch Relations during the Embassy of Cornelis Calkoen, 1726–1744*, van Gendt, Amsterdam, 1977.
- Bovill, E. V., *English Country Life, 1780–1830*, Oxford University Press, London, 1962.
- Briggs, A., *How They Lived*, vol. 3, Blackwell, Oxford, 1969.
- British Archives, *A Guide to Archive Resources in the UK*, 4th edn, Palgrave, London, 2002.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- British Library General Catalogue of Printed Books*, K. G. Saur, London, 1985.
- Burzbach, C. Von (ed.), *Biographisches Lexicon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, Wien, 1881.
- Butt, J. (ed.), *The Poems of Alexander Pope*, Twickenham edition, Methuen, 1939.
- Buchholz, R. O., *The Augustan Court*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1993.
- Bull, D. et al., *Jean-Etienne Liotard (1702–1789)*, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, 2002.
- The Ambassador, the Sultan and the Artist*, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, 2003.
- Burzbach, C. von (ed.), *Biographisches Lexicon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, Wien, 1881.
- Cantemir, D., *History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire*, London, 1734–37.
- Extracts edited by A. Dutu et al., Bucharest, 1973.
- Carswell, J., *South Sea Bubble*, P. Cresset, London, 1960.
- Cassels, L., *The Struggle for the Ottoman Empire, 1717–40*, John Murray, London, 1966.
- Chaudhri, R. A., *Muslim Festivals and Ceremonies*, London Mosque, London, 1984.
- Christie, C., *The British Country House in the Eighteenth Century*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2000.
- Colley, L., *In Defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party 1714–60*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.
- Collins, A., *Historical Collections of the Noble Families of Cavendish, Holles, Vere, Harley, and Ogle: With the Lives of the Most Remarkable Persons, particularly of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle. Henry Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle ...*, London, 1752.
- Collins's Peerage of England*, F. C. & J. Rivington, London, editions of 1756, 1779 and 1812.
- Cook, M. A., *A History of the Ottoman Empire to 1730*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1976.
- Cowan, S., *The Ancient Capital of Scotland: The Story of Perth from the Invasion of Agricola to the Passing of the Reform Bill*, vol. 2, Simpkin Marshall Hamilton Kent & Co., London, 1904.
- Coxe, W., *Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole*, London, 1798.
- Danielson, H., *Sverige och Frankrike 1727–1735, et bidrag till belysning av Arvid Horns utrikespolitik*, Lund, 1920.
- Davis, R., *Aleppo and Devonshire Square*, Macmillan, London, 1967.
- Dearborn, H., *Memoir on Commerce and Navigation of Black Sea and Trade Maritime Geography of Turkey and Egypt*, 2 vols, Wells and Lilly, Boston, 1819.
- de Guys, M., *Sentimental Journey through Greece: in a series of letters written from Constantinople*, T. Cadell, London, 1773.
- de la Motraye, A., *Travels through Europe, Asia and into Part of Africa*, London, 1723.
- Dickinson, H. T., *Walpole and the Whig Supremacy*, English University Press, London, 1973.
- Dictionary of National Biography*, London, 1891.
- Dictionary of National Biography from the Earliest Times to 1900*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1968.
- Dover, T., *The Ancient Physician's Legacy to his Country: Being what he has collected himself in forty-nine years' practice ...* (first published 1732), fourth edition, London, 1733.
- Duparc, Pierre, *Recueil des instructions donnees aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France depuis les traits de Westphalie jusqu'à la revolution francaise*, vol. 29: Turquie, Editions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, Paris, 1969.
- Epstein, M., *The Early History of the Levant Company*, Routledge, London, 1908.
- Ferriol, Charles de, *Recueil de cent Estampes qui representant les différentes Nations du Levant ...*, Paris, 1714–15.
- Finch, P., *History of Burley-on-the-Hill*, John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, London, 1901.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Finkel, C., *Osman's dream*, John Murray, London, 2005.
- Fittis K. S., *Historical and Traditional Gleanings of Pethshire*, Perth, 1876.
- Fosca, F., *Liotard (1702–1789)*, André Delpeuch, Paris, 1928.
- Foster, Sir W., *England's Quest of Eastern Trade*, A. & C. Black, London, 1933.
- Freely, J., *Istanbul*, Viking, London, 1996.
- Inside the Seraglio*, Viking, London, 1999.
- Fritz, P. S., *The English Ministers and Jacobitism between the Rebellions of 1715 and 1745*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1975.
- Frye, R. (ed.), *Islam and the West*, Mouton & Co., The Hague, 1957.
- Gibb, H. and H. Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West: Islamic Society in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1950.
- Gilles of Albi, Pierre, *The Antiquities of Constantinople* (trans. J. Ball), London, 1729.
- Gilley, S. and W. J. Sheils (eds), *A History of Religion in Britain: Practice and Belief from Pre-Roman Times to the Present*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1944.
- Girouard, M., *Life in the English Country House*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1978.
- Glass, H., *The Servant's Directory or House-keeper's Companion*, London, 1760.
- Gocek, F. M., *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1987.
- Gopin, S. A., 'Jean-Baptiste Vanmour: A Painter of Turqueries', dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, 1994.
- Grenville, H., *Observations sur l'état actuel de l'empire ottoman (1766)*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1965.
- Grundy, I., *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999.
- (Guardi, F.), *Quadri turcheschi: Exhibition Catalogue*, Palazzo Cini, Venezia, Electa, Milan, 1993.
- Hamilton, A. et al. (eds) *Friends and Rivals in the East: Studies in Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Levant from the Seventeenth Century to the Early Nineteenth Century*, Brill, Leiden, 2000.
- Harte, N. and R. Quinault (eds), *Land and Society in Britain 1700–1914*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1996.
- Hasluck, F. W., *The Levantine Coinage*, Numismatics Chronicle 5th series, 1, pp. 39–91
- Hazlitt, Gooden & Fox, *At the Sublime Porte: Ambassadors to the Ottoman Empire 1550–1800*, Exhibition Catalogue, Hazlitt Gallery, Balding & Mansell, London, 1988.
- Heasel, A., *The Servants' Book of Knowledge*, London, 1773.
- Hecht, J., *The Domestic Servant Classes in the Eighteenth Century*, Routledge, London, 1956.
- Hill, A., *A Full and Just Account of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, (2nd edn), J. Mayo, London, 1710.
- A General History of the Ottoman Empire*, London, 1740.
- Hill, B., *Servants: English Domestic in the Eighteenth Century*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1996.
- Hill, D. J., *History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe*, Longmans, Green, & Company, New York, 1905.
- Hole, C., *English Home Life*, Batsford, London, 1947.
- Holt, P. M. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Islam*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970.
- Horn, D. B., 'British Diplomatic Representatives, 1689–1789', *Royal Historical Society, Camden Third Series*, vol. 46, London, 1932, p. 154.
- The British Diplomatic Service 1689–1789*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1961.
- Horn, P., *Flinkeys and Scullions*, Sutton Publishing, Stroud, 2004.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hunter, J., *South Yorkshire: History and Topography of the Deanery of Doneaster*, 2 vols, J. B. Nichols, London, 1828–31, reprinted EP Publishing, Wakefield, 1974.
- Hunter, T., *Woods Forests and Estates of Perthshire*, Henderson, Robertson and Hunter, Perth, 1883.
- Inalcik, H. and D. Quataert (eds), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1914*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- Jacob, G., *The Country Gentleman's Vademecum*, London, 1717.
- Kamal, A., *Sacred Journey*, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1964.
- Kerslake, J., *Early Georgian Portraits*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1977.
- Kolodziejczyk, D., *Ottoman–Polish Diplomatic Relations (15th–18th Century)*, Brill, Leiden, 2000.
- Kurat, A. N. (ed.), *The Despatches of Sir Robert Sutton, Ambassador in Constantinople 1710–1714*, Royal Historical Society, London, Camden Third Series, vol. 78, 1953.
- Lenman, B., *Jacobite Risings in Britain 1689–1746*, Methuen, London, 1989.
- Lewis, B., *Muslim Discovery of Europe*, Norton, New York, 1982.
- Lewis, R., *Everyday Life in Ottoman Turkey*, Putnam, New York, 1971.
- Lockhart, L., 'Fifteen Guns', *Royal Central Asian Society Journal*, vol. 23, part 4, October 1936.
- Nadir Shah*, Luzac & Co., London, 1938.
- Macdonald, J., *Memoirs of an Eighteenth Century Footman: John Macdonald's Travels 1745–79*, Century, London, 1985.
- McCarthy, J., *The Ottoman Turks*, Longmans, London, 1997.
- McKendrick, N. (ed), *Historical Perspectives*, Europa, London, 1974.
- Mansel, P., *Constantinople, City of the World's Desire, 1453–1924*, Penguin Books Ltd, London, 1995.
- Marsigli, Comte L. F. de, *Stato militare dell'impero ottomano*, The Hague, 1732, Akademische Druck, 1972.
- Matthews, W., *British Diaries: An Annotated Bibliography of British Diaries Written Between 1442 and 1942*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1950.
- Medley, R. C. et al. (eds) *A Medley Omnibus*, 5th revision 2004 (and earlier versions), privately published but available at the Genealogical Society, London.
- Medley, Samuel, *Memoirs of the Late Rev. Samuel Medley, Compiled by his Son*, J. Johnson, London, 1800.
- Medley, Sarah, *Memoirs of Samuel Medley formerly Minister of the Baptist Chapel in Liverpool*, J. Jones, Liverpool, 1833.
- Original Poems, Sacred and Miscellaneous*, Liverpool, 1807.
- Miller, B., *Beyond the Sublime Porte: The Grand Seraglio of Stamboul*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1931.
- Miller, E., *History and Antiquities of Doncaster*, W. Sheardown, Doncaster, 1804.
- Mordant, J., *The Complete Steward*, London, 1761.
- Mowat, R., *History of European Diplomacy 1451–1789*, Longmans, London, 1928.
- Murray, E. C. G., *Embassies and Foreign Courts*, Routledge, London, 1855.
- Naff, T., 'Ottoman Diplomatic Relations with Europe in the Eighteenth Century: Patterns and Trends', *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History*, 1977, pp. 88–107.
- Naff, T. and R. Owen (eds) *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale.
- Namier, L. B., *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, Macmillan, London, 1929.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Nepluev, I. I., *Zapiski 1693–1773*, Oriental Research Partners, Cambridge, 1974.
- Numers, L Von., *Paschan I Onåd: Bidrag till kännedomen om Bonneval Ahmet Pascha, hövitsman för Sultanens mörsartrupper, beglerbeg av Karamanien med rang av två hästsvansar, lekbroder I de dansande dervischernas samfund, förutvarande kejsarlig Obrist-Feldzeugmeister, statsfånge och renegat*, F. J. Marienwald, Nordstedt, 1981.
- Ogg, D., *Europe of the Ancien Régime*, Fontana, London, 1965.
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
- Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*, 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1956.
- Pallis, A., *In the Days of the Janissaries*, Hutchinson, London, 1951.
- Paul, J. B. (ed.), *The Scots Peerage Founded on Wood's edition of Sir Robert Douglas's Peerage of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1908.
- Peerage of Scotland (Douglas)*, Edinburgh, editions of 1764 and 1813 (edited by Wood).
- Perry, Charles, *A View of the Levant: Particularly Constantinople*, T. Woodward, London, 1743.
- Pittock, M., *Jacobitism*, Macmillan, London, 1988.
- Plumb, J. H., *England in the Eighteenth Century*, Pelican Books, Penguin, London, 1950.
- Growth of political stability in England 1675–1725*, Macmillan, London, 1967.
- Sir Robert Walpole*, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, London, 1972.
- Pomfret, J., *The Poetical Works of John Pomfret*, Apollo Press, Edinburgh, 1779.
- Porter, J., *Turkey: Its History and Progress*, Hurst & Blackett, London, 1854.
- Prideaux, H., *The true nature of imposture fully display'd in the life of Mahomet*, London, 1697.
- Relandus, *De Religione Mohammedica libri duo*, Ultrajecti (Broedelet) 1705.
- Ribiero, A., 'Turquerie: Turkish Dress and English Fashion in the Eighteenth Century', *Connoisseur*, The Journal of the Canadian Institute for Conservation, 1979, pp. 16–23.
- Riley, P., *The English Ministers and Scotland 1707–27*, Athlone Press, London, 1964.
- Roberts, D. S., *Islam: A Westerner's Guide*, Hamlyn Paperbacks, Feltham, 1982.
- Robinson, M (ed.), *The Concise Scots Dictionary*, Aberdeen University Press, Aberdeen, 1985.
- Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts: Portland Manuscripts (Harley papers)*, 10 vols, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1891–1931.
- Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts: Calendar of the Stuart Papers*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1902.
- Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts: Calendar of the manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1904–, vol.3: *The Prior papers*.
- Rycaut, P., *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1668) New York, 1971.
- Saussure, C. de, *Lettres de Turquie, 1730–39*, Budapest, 1909.
- Shankland, D., *Islam and Society in Turkey*, Eothen Press, Huntingdon, 1999.
- Shaw, S. J., *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1976.
- Shay, M. L., *The Ottoman Empire from 1720 to 1734, as Revealed in Despatches of the Venetian Baili*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1944.
- Sint Nicolaas, E. S et al., *An Eyewitness of the Tulip Era: Jean-Baptiste Vanmour*, Kocbank, Istanbul, 2003.
- Smith, B. and M. Handley, *Brodsworth and Pickburn: A Tale of Two Villages*, Brodsworth and Pickburn Local History Society, Brodsworth, 1996.
- Stanford, W. B. and E. J. Finopoulos (eds), *The Travels of Lord Charlemont in Greece and Turkey 1749*, Trigraph for the A. G. Leventis Foundation, London, 1984.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Stiles, A., *Russia, Poland and the Ottoman Empire, 1725–1800*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1991.
- Stonelake, Richard (ed.) *Twenty-nine Unpublished Hymns by Samuel Medley (1738–1799)*, Shaftesbury Avenue Publications, London, 1999.
- Svenskt Biografiskt Lexikon*, Stockholm, 1971–73.
- Sweetman, J., *The Oriental Obsession*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- Swift, J., *Direction to Servants: In General, and in Particular, to the Butler, ... upon the Report of Her Majesty's death London*, printed for J. Morphew, London, 1745.
- Szechi, D., *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688–1788*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1994.
- Tapper, R. (ed.), *Islam in Modern Turkey: Religion, Politics and Literature in a Secular State*, I.B.Tauris, London, 1991.
- Tayler, A. N. and H. Tayler, *The Stuart Papers at Windsor: Being Selections from Hitherto Unprinted Royal Archives*, John Murray, London, 1939.
- The Complete Peerage*, The St Catherine Press, London, 1929.
- The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th edition, H. H. Benton, Chicago, 1982.
- The House of Commons 1690–1715*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, for the History of Parliament Trust, 2002.
- The House of Commons 1715–54*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, for the History of Parliament Trust, 1970.
- Tollot, J. D., *Nouveau Voyage fait en Levant 1731–32*, Cailleau, Paris, 1742.
- Trumbach, R., *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, Academic Press, London, 1978.
- Turner, E. S., *What the Butler Saw*, Michael Joseph, London, 1962.
- Vandal, A., *Une ambassade française en Orient sous Louis XV: la mission du Marquis de Villeneuve 1728–41*, Paris, 1887.
- van den Boogert, M. H., 'The Capitulations and the Ottoman Legal System: Kadis, Consuls, and Beraths in the 18th Century', *Studies in Islamic Law and Society*, vol. 21, 2005.
- Van der Kiste, J., *King George II and Queen Caroline*, Sutton, Stroud, 1997.
- Vaucher, P., *La crise du ministere Walpole 1733–4*, Plon-Nourrit et cie, Paris, 1924.
- Vitevski, V. N., I. I. *Neplivuev i orenburgskii kraï v prezhnem ego sostave do 1758 g.*, Kazan, 1897.
- Walsh, R., *Account of the Levant Company*, Printed for J. & J. Arch, London, 1825.
- Whiting, C. E. (ed.), *Parish Register of Brodsworth 1538–1813*, vol. 104, Yorkshire Parish Register Society, Leeds, 1937.
- Williams, B., 'The Foreign Office of the First Two Georges', *Blackwoods Magazine*, vol. 181, 1907, p. 99.
- The Whig Supremacy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1962.
- Williams, E. N., *The Ancien Regime in Europe*, Bodley Head, London, 1970.
- Wills, R., *The Jacobites and Russia, 1715–1750*, Tuckwell Press, East Linton, 2002.
- Wilson, A. M., *French Foreign Policy During the Administration of Cardinal Fleury 1726–43*, Harvard Historical Studies 40, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1936.
- Wood, A. C., 'The English Embassy at Constantinople 1660–1762', *English Historical Review*, vol. 40, 1925.
- History of the Levant Company*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1964.
- Wortley Montagu, Lady M., *The Turkish Embassy Letters* (edited by M. Jack), Virago, London, 1994.
- Letters from the Levant: During the Embassy to Constantinople 1716–18*, J. Rickerby, London, 1838, Arno Press, New York, 1971.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Yorke, P. (ed.), *Miscellaneous Published Documents*, ed. Hardwicke, 1501–1726, London, 1778.

Zwicker, S. N. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature 1650–1649*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

NEWSPAPERS AND JOURNALS

Gentleman's magazine, London, various editions, c.1735.

Nature medicine, July 1996, vol. 2, no. 7.

St James's Evening Post, London, various editions c.1735.

Scots Magazine, Edinburgh, 1739–60.

The Daily Courant, London, 1735 editions.

The Daily Journal, London, various editions c.1735.

The Daily Post, London, 1733 editions.

The European Lawyer, July/August, 2004.

INTERNET RESOURCES

Many internet sites have been found useful, notably of archives and libraries, including www.copac.ac.uk, and those with genealogical information such as www.ancestry.com and www.stirnet.com. Specific references, with date of access, will be found in the Notes.

MANUSCRIPTS

Bodleian Library, University of Oxford

MS.Don.c.182/1–12, fol. 2r.; MS.Don.d.193, fols. 2v.–5r.

The British Library

Leeds papers: Eg.3385A, ff. 84, 90, 94, 98, 100, 102, 115, 119, 120; 3428 f. 131.

Letter of the Earl of Kinnoull to Sir Hans Sloane: Sloane 4050 f. 183.

Harley letters: Add 4291 ff. 234, 236, 238.

The Gualterio correspondence (John Hay of Cromlix): Add 20295 ff. 380–406; 20303; 31264–6.

Letter of Thomas Hay to Dr Colbatch: Add 22908 f. 148.

Letters to Thomas Robinson: Add 23781 ff. 222, 404; 23782 ff. 49, 51, 446; 23783 ff. 44, 435, 546; 23784 ff. 103, 127; 23785 ff. 15, 166, 278; 23787 ff. 37, 116; 23788 ff. 95, 175, 177, 211, 219, 222, 313; 23789 ff. 19, 80, 193, 352, 379; 23790 ff. 25, 208, 249, 346; 23791 f. 253; 23792 ff. 105, 140–9, 176, 278, 333, 339; 23793 ff. 1, 6, 69, 155, 195, 209, 235, 288, 331, 359; 23794/ ff. 3, 136, 274; 23795 ff. 66288, 98, 111, 113, 131, 143, 190; 23796 ff. 68, 111; 23797 f. 195.

Letters of Lady Abigail Hay to the Duke of Leeds: Add 28050–1.

Duke of Newcastle: correspondence: Add 32687; 32691 f. 284; 32695 f. 529; 32697; 32710; 32722 ff. 151, 183; 32731 f. 195; 32792 f. 311; 32860 f. 391.

Duke of Newcastle: diplomatic papers: Add 33006; 33007.

Duke of Newcastle: Domestic and private correspondence: Add 33064–5.

Letter of the Earl of Kinnoull to Lord Foley: Add 38507 f. 183.

Correspondence of Sir Robert Peel: Add 40613 f. 63.

Petition to Treasury Commissioners : Add 61623 ff. 8–12b.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Portland Papers: Add 70147; 70241; 70292; 70378 ff. 34, 43, 122, 127; 70379 ff. 44, 49, 148, 154, 158, 162, 166, 172, 174; 70383 ff. 51, 60; 70412–70419; 70434–5; 70444; 70497–8.

Walpole papers: Add 73984–5.

Fawkener papers: Add 74076, 74078.

Cambridge University Library

Cholmondeley (Houghton) Papers, c.1330–1870 (Walpole archive).

Ch(H), Correspondence, 1, 2720 (Kinnoull to Walpole, 1737).

Ch(H), Political papers, 26, 138 (Kinnoull to Walpole re the Grand Vizier).

Chol. 3279 ('Lady Hay de Kinnoull').

Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies

HALS: Delmé Radcliffe Collection D/ER:B226/92; D/ER:B226/93; D/ER B388.

Nationaal Archief Staten Generaal, Den Haag

1550–1796 Inv. nr. 7003 (Calkoen to Fagel, 21.1.1735, and enclosures).

National Archives of Scotland, H M General Register House, Edinburgh

GD1/609/2/45; GD1/609/7–11; GD1/609/9/4; GD1/609/11/6; GD18/5052;

GD24/1/475; GD24/1/488; GD124/15/390, 519, 834, 859, 931, 1198, 1208(3,/6),

1217, 1225; GD 136/141 Vol.26; GD220/5/206/3; NRAS3698/716.

The National Archives (TNA) formerly the Public Record Office (PRO)

Admiralty: ships musters (Series 1): (TNA) ADM 36/4286–7 (Muster roll, HMS *Torrington* 1729–30).

Admiralty: captains' logs: (TNA) ADM 51/1004 (HMS *Torrington*).

Admiralty: Masters' logs: (TNA) ADM 52/503 (HMS *Torrington*).

Court of King's Bench: Crown side: Precedents and Miscellanea: (TNA) KB 33/32.

Secretaries of State: State Papers domestic: George II: (TNA) SP 36/9.

Secretaries of State: State Papers foreign, France: (TNA) SP 78/180.

Secretaries of State: State Papers foreign, Russia: (TNA) SP 91/12, 91/17, 91/18, 91/20, 91/21.

Secretaries of State: State Papers foreign, Turkey: (TNA) SP 97/25, 97/26, 97/27, 97/28, 97/29, 97/41, 97/56, 97/60.

Secretaries of State: State Papers foreign, Archives of British Legations: (TNA) SP 105/109, 105/117, 105/164, 105/182, 105/202, 105/209–10, 105/218, 105/332.

Secretaries of State: State Papers foreign, Supplementary: (TNA) SP 110/26, 110/27, 110/28, 110/60, 110/61, 110/74.

Maps: (TNA) MPH1/117/108276 (Map of the Bosphorus and Constantinople).

The National Library of Scotland

Acc. 8074; Mf. 9(8[9])

Adv. MSS 23.3.27 f. 14; 23.3.28 f. 315; 29.1.1(ii) ff. 34–6; 29.1.2 (iv) ff. 728; 82.1.3 ff. 65, 214; 82.2.7 f. 122; 82.3.6 f. 20; 82.4.4 ff. 328; 82.4.7 f. 114; MS 2968 f. 54; MS 16529 ff. 164–6; MS16533 ff. 252–4; MS 16543 f. 18; MS 16565 f.251; MS17607 f. 69; MS.17610 ff. 13–32, 34–6 (deeds 1723–4); MS 17614 f.1; MS 17723 f. 221; MS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

17614 f. 16; MS21101 ff. 3, 7, 9, 11–13, 19–25, 30, 32, 34, 42, 112, 117, 122–5, 130, 132, 142, 152–61, 169–74, 256; Ry.III.a.16 (114–16).

Perth & Kinross Council Archives, A. K. Bell Library, Perth

B 59/22/35 (Rental of Kinnoul lands 1719);

L 929.2 (The Earls of Kinnoul (tree etc.))

The Royal Bank of Scotland Group Archives

GB 1502/DR/427/1, 2 & 3.

Yorkshire Archaeological Society

DD132, DD168, MS1238, MS891

Glossary

Entries apparently unique to the diary and substantially unusual forms of spelling found in the diary are shown in round brackets. Modern Turkish equivalents are shown in square brackets.

(Acmedon)	See Ockmedon
Aga, Agha (Auga)	A Turkish commander or chief officer [Ağa]
Aleppo	now Halab in Syria. The port for Aleppo was Scanderoon [İskenderun] east-northeast of Cyprus, about 900 miles by sea from Constantinople, on the route of many Levant Company ships.
Arraba	Cart for transport of goods and people [Araba (cart/carriage/car)]
Atmedon	(Identified by Medley as Attmedon). The old hippodrome in the centre of Constantinople, near the Blue Mosque [At Meydanı (the horse arena)]
Bailo (biloo; byloo)	Venetian ambassador
Balchaque	A village three miles from Belgrade village, now no longer existing. [Perhaps Balçak (handguard on a sword) or Balçık (wet clay).]
Barat, Berat	Document giving possessor benefits under capitulations [Berat]
Bayram (Byram)	Muslim festival. See Little Bayram and Great Bayram [Bayram]
Bazaar (bazerleen)	Market [Pazar]
Belgrade village	A village about 14 miles from Pera, in Belgrade forest [Belgrat Ormanı], where Lord Kinnoull, among others, had a country retreat.
Bendt	Artificial reservoir [Bend]
Beshiktash (Besictach)	On the west side of the Bosphorus, near the present site of Dolmabache Palace [Beşiktaş]
Bostangi bashi	Chief imperial guard; head gardener; also chief executioner; also steersman of Grand Signior's barge! [Bostancı başı]
(Buctree) Buyukdere	Southeast of Belgrade village on the west shore of the Bosphorus [Büyükdere (big valley)]
Burgos	Village near Belgrade village, no longer existing

GLOSSARY

Cancellier	(cancellare; cancellere) Secretary to the Levant Company in Constantinople
Candia	Crete [Girit]
(Canal)	Word Medley used to describe the Bosphorus
Capigee	Doorkeeper [Kapıcı]
Capitulations	Trading concessions [Kapitülasyonlar]
Cassim Pacha	(Casham Bashaw). The area of the city north of the Golden Horn and west of Pera [Kasımpaşa]
Chaious bashi	(Cavush bashi) Commander of the imperial messengers and of the detachment detailed to accompany foreign ambassadors at audience with the Sultan [Çavuşbaşı]
Chair	Sedan chair
Chehaia	See Kahya
(Conncapee)	See Koum Kapoussi
Custom master	Turkish port official in charge of customs duties
(Damezan)	Demijohn
Danzig (Danzik)	Now Gdansk, on the northern (Baltic) coast of Poland
Defterdar, daftardar	Treasurer or finance minister [Defterdar]
Dervish	Member of a religious order particularly known for achieving a trance-like state through a whirling dance [Derviş]
Devshirme	Forced levy of slave children from the Christian populations of the Empire [Devşirme]
Divan	The ruling council, or sultan's cabinet – also responsible for administration of justice [Dîvân-i Hümâyûn]
Dolmabache	(Dollmabash) On the west side of the Bosphorus near Beshiktash [Dolmabahçe ('filled-in garden' – on reclaimed land – near Beşiktaş)]
(Domusdery)	Village north of Belgrade village, near the south shore of the Black Sea [Domuzdere (wild pig valley)]
Dragoman	(druggerman) Interpreter [Tercüman (from the Arabic 'tarjuman')]
Effendi	Scribe/secretary ('man of the pen') [Efendi (master, gentleman, Sir!)]
Fatwa	An encoded piece of Islamic law issued by the Sheik ul Islam [Fetva]
Frank	European [Frenk]
Galata (Galletta)	Section of Constantinople to the north of the Golden Horn, looking across to the Seraglio, where most of the non-Turkish population lived [Galata – district of the Galatians]
Gendry meadow	Now Deshendere. Popular stopping-off place between Pera and Belgrade village [Deşendere]
Giaour = Hog	non-Turkish European [Gavur]

GLOSSARY

Giovane di lingua	(jovena) A trainee interpreter often required to make written translations
Grand Vizier	the sultan's executive arm; the most powerful person after the sultan [Vezir]
Grand Signor	(Grand Signior) the sultan
Great Bayram	Muslim festival of Eid-ul-Fitr [Şeker Bayram ('holiday of sweets')]
Hamam	Turkish bath [Hamam]
Harem	The women's part of a Muslim dwelling-house [Harem]
House of Felicity	The Sultan's harem
Imam	Muslim (prayer) leader [imam]
Jackoos	A tavern in Galata
Janissary (janesary)	Infantryman; guard [Yeni çeri (new army/militia)]
Joppa	Now Yafo, a port in Israel, south of Tel Aviv
Jupe	The potter's street, probably in the northwest corner of the old city, across the Golden Horn from the coast west of Pera [Cüppe (?)]
Kadi	Judge, under Muslim law [Kadı]
Kafir	Non-Muslim, misbeliever
Kahya	Great steward [Kahya]
Kapicibashi	Chief doorkeeper and master of ceremonies at recaptions for foreign ambassadors [Kapicibaşı]
Kaptan Pasha	(Captin Bashaw) The Admiral of the fleet [Kaptan Paşa]
Kiosk (keosk)	Light, open pavilion [Köşk]
Kısla Aga	The chief black eunuch in charge of the House of Felicity [Kışla Ağa]
Koum Kapoussi	(Conncapee) The sandgate on the Marmara coast southwest of the Sultanahmet mosque [Kumkapı]
Lale devri	The Tulip period; referring especially to the reign of Ahmed III 1703-30 [Lale devri]
Little Bayram	Muslim festival of Eid-ul-Adha, about ten weeks after Eid-ul-Fitr [Kurban Bayram (sacrifice holiday)]
Livorno	(Leghorn) Port on the west coast of Italy
Medrese	College for the study of Islamic law [Medrese]
Mevlevi, meylevi	An order of dervishes [Mevlevi]
Mufti (Sheik ul Islam)	The chief scholar responsible for the interpretation of Islamic law [Müftü/Müfti]
Ockmedon	(Ackmedon) Medley in fact referred to it as acmedon. Area on the north side of the Golden Horn, to the west of Cassim Pacha, used for archery practice [Okmeydanı (Ok = arrow; meydan – arena/square)]
Ovid's tower	A tower north of Belgrade village
Padishah	A Turkish title normally restricted to the sultan but occasionally used for the French king [Padişah]

GLOSSARY

Pasha (Bashaw)	Turkish title given to governors and high ranking naval officers [Paşa]
Pera (Peara)	Section of Constantinople to the north of the Golden Horn, adjacent to and above Galata, looking across to the Seraglio, where most of the embassies were situated [Pera]
Pest	Bubonic plague
Pilau	Rice dish [Pilav]
Pillar	The Serpentine brass figure is to be found in the At Meydani; originally from the Temple of Apollo at Delphi
Pillars, The three	Three monuments in the At Meydani
Port Mahoun	Now Mahon, a port on Minorca in the Balearic Islands
Quartastrada	(quarter strad) Street running parallel to the coast (behind the road nearest to the coast) on the east side of Galata
Ragionateria	Store of goods kept by the Venetian bailo as gifts for Turks
Ragousia	Dubrovnik, then a city state
Reis effendi	The head of chancery; the minister responsible for foreign affairs; the secretary of state [Reis efendi = Reisül'-küttab]
Sa'adabad	(Sattabat) A pleasure palace of the sultan in the Valley of Sweet Waters [Saadabad]
Salonica	Now Thessaloniki, the major port of northern Greece 400 miles west of Istanbul [Selanik]
Santa Lucia	(St Lucy) A Saint's day celebrated in Italy (particularly) on 13 December, when presents are given
Santa Sophia	Built in the sixth century by order of Justinian as a Christian church; converted to a mosque in 1453 [Aya Sofya]
Scale	Steps (the Italian word), apparently used synonymously with Seale (see below)
Scrivan effendi	Turkish scribe, for example employed by the British
Scutari	(Scutary) Now Uskudar, on the Asian side of the Bosphorus [Üsküdar]
Seale	Landing stage (for example on north side of Bosphorus, west of Pera) [İskele (landing stage, ladder, scaffolding – from the Greek; a cognate of 'skeleton')]
Seraglio (Serallio)	The sultan's palace [Saray (palace)]
Sharia Law	Islamic law
Sherap House	[Şarap (wine)]
Sheik ul Islam	Mufti, the chief scholar responsible for interpretation of Islamic law [Şeyh-ul islam]
Sipahi	Cavalry [Sipahi]

GLOSSARY

(Slucer)	The German smith, the blacksmith
Smyrna	Now Izmir, southwest of Istanbul, on the west coast of Turkey about 200 miles from Istanbul by sea [İzmir]
Spassa	An outing for pleasure (The Italian word spasso = entertainment; essere a spasso = to be out for a walk)
(Stamboll)	Constantinople [İstanbul]
Sublime Porte	The translation into French (the language of diplomacy) of the name of the palace, Bâb-i âlî, in which the Dîvân met; i.e. the ‘the lofty gate’
Sultan	The Ottoman Empire’s secular and religious supreme ruler; also commander in chief of the army [Sultan]
Sultan Achmed mosque	Known as the Blue Mosque or Sultanahmed Camii [Sultan Ahmet Cami(i)]
Tarapea	(Terapee, Tarrapea) On the west coast of the Bosphorus, southeast of Belgrade village [Tarabya]
(Taverem)	Tavern [Taverna]
Tekke	Dervishes’ lodge [Tekke]
Topena	Area of city north of the Golden Horn and east of Pera. [Tophane]
Ulema	Scholars responsible for interpreting Islamic law [Ulema]
Valide (Vallade)	Valide Sultan was the title of the mother of the Sultan [Valide]
Village, Other	Possibly Burgos: see above
Vizier (Vizir)	Important Turkish official [Vezir]

Index

General categories of clothing and cloth, currency, food (consumption and purchase of), health and weather are included. Separate indices to Medley's diary and to his reading matter are found, along with the complete diary, on www.leginipress.co.uk

- Abbott, 163, 192, 195
Achmet Bey, 19
Ahmed III, Sultan, 26, 56, 59–61, 195, 248
Ahmet Pasha, Grand Vizier 80; *see also* Bonneval
Aleppo, 68, 76–8, 201–2, 204–5, 237, 246
Ali Pasha, Grand Vizier, 59, 80, 84, 87, 195
Allexander, 163, 195
allowance (of ambassadors), 7, 68, 70, 74, 83, 119, 214
Amilla, 147, 162, 195
Aqueduct, 19, 26, 60
Armenia/Armenian, 16–19, 33, 43, 70
Arrabas, 25, 137, 141, 150, 171, 246
Ashford, Middlesex, 124, 133
Atmedon, 149, 246
Auctions, 21, 143, 147, 151, 166, 168, 197
Augustus II of Saxony, 81–2, 195, 199
Augustus III; *see* Frederick Augustus
Austrian policy and representative; *see* Thalmann
Azov, 44, 89

Bailo/biloo/byloo; Venetian policy and ambassador, 43–4, 48, 52, 57, 63–5, 67–8, 73–5, 83, 102–3, 106, 109, 113, 130, 135, 146, 155, 159–63, 196–9, 202–3, 246, 249

Balchaque, 141, 152, 246
Ball, J., 27, 195, 239
Ballmore, 161, 195
Baptista, tailor, 146, 195
Barat/berat, 70, 125, 242, 246
Barbados, 117, 121, 123, 128
Barker, Benjamin, 109, 114, 141, 153–5, 162, 195
Bartolini, Orazio, 196
Bazaar/bazerleen, 28, 146, 248, 61, 66, 73
Belgrade, Treaty of, 81, 90, 204
Belgrade village, 19–20, 22–3, 25–7, 29, 85, 90–1, 101, 103–4, 120, 129–30, 133–5, 137–8, 140–3, 148, 150, 153, 158, 171, 183, 192, 203, 246–8, 250
bendt 19, 246
Berwick, Duke of 86, 196
Beshiktash, Besictach, 13, 168, 246–7
bird catching, 25–6, 135, 151, 200
Bland, Henry, 77, 151, 196, 207
Bollang(e), 151, 196
Bol(l)ton, 147, 165
Bonneval, General Claude–Alexandre, Comte de, 22, 47, 49, 58, 60, 83, 87–8, 92, 94, 97–8, 102, 106, 108, 118, 126, 163, 195–6, 241
bostangi bashi, 13, 246
Bower, Dr, 5
Bragiotti, 146–7, 196
Brodsworth, 2–3, 6–7, 122, 124, 190, 209, 241–2

INDEX

- Brown, Thomas, 29, 132, 140, 145–9, 152–3, 165, 196, 200, 202, 204
- Burgos, 171, 246, 248
- Butler, ix–xiii, 74, 128–94
- Buyukdere, 26, 246
- Calendar, xiii
- Calkoen, Cornelius, 20–1, 24–6, 33, 37–8, 43, 45–6, 48, 52–3, 59, 63–5, 67–9, 71, 74, 82–4, 86, 89–91, 95, 98–114, 118, 127, 134–7, 141, 144, 157–61, 163, 169–70, 172, 182–3, 196, 196, 204, 237, 239
- Cancellier/cancellare/cancellere, 13, 21, 28, 32, 77, 134, 137, 151, 196, 198, 205, 207, 247
- Candia (Crete), 81, 168, 247
- Capige, 140, 247
- Capitulations, 43–5, 51, 61, 67–8, 70, 86, 125, 158, 242, 246–7
- Carleson, Edvard, Carlson, *see* Swedish policy and representatives
- Carlowitz, Treaty of, 44–5, 58, 125, 206
- Cavendish, William, 2nd Duke of Devonshire, 8, 116, 125, 197, 238
- chaios bashi, 37–8, 40–1, 247
- chair (as transport), 20, 25, 136, 151, 247
- chaplain, *see* Payne
- Charlemont, Baron, 17, 28, 32, 241
- Charles VI, Holy Roman Emperor, 44, 46, 197
- Charles XII of Sweden, 90, 92, 94, 197
- Chehaia/kahya, Great Steward, 51–2, 61, 95, 247–8
- Chief Dragoman, *see* Dragoman of the Porte
- Chelebi, Evliya, 18
- Chirico, Luca, 26, 66, 88, 95–9, 102–3, 107–8, 110–12, 114, 156, 197, 200, 202, 204
- Chiswell, Richard, 17, 164, 197, 234
- Clark(e), William (and family) 34, 77, 97, 104, 114, 132–3, 138–45, 147, 149, 155, 168, 171–2, 184, 197
- Clelland, 4
- climate, *see* weather
- clothing, cloth, 13, 18, 20–1, 27–8, 31, 34, 37–8, 41, 45, 48, 68, 71, 94–5, 106, 139, 143–6, 151, 156, 161, 196, 234
- communication, 17, 33, 36, 56, 62–7, 87, 126–7, 179
- conncappee, 137, 247, 248
- Constantine, Robert, 16, 34, 197, 201, 206
- Constantinople (Stambol), information on, 16–35, 42–9, 54–70, 73, 91, 117, 142, 146, 161, 166, 169
- Contarini, 159, 197
- cossacks, 44
- Coutery/Coutrees/Cutorere/Cuttroe, 161, 197–8
- Craigie, Robert, 123–4, 197
- currency, 214–16
- custom (= convention), 17, 19–21, 29–33, 36, 68, 71–3, 139
- custom duties, custom master, 44, 68, 70, 81, 157, 247
- Dandallo, 159, 163, 197
- Danzig (Danzik), 59, 83, 86, 247
- Dardenelles, The, 12
- date, *see* calendar
- Dease, Dess, 163–5, 198
- Death/Dee(a)th, Mr, 155, 163, 198
- de Ferriol, 21
- defterdar/daftardar, Turkish treasurer, 41, 55, 247
- de Flander, 162, 198
- de Guys, M., 22, 220–1
- Delafaye, Charles, 9, 13, 22, 37, 65, 67, 71, 87, 95, 97, 198
- Dervishes, 18, 32, 153, 167–8, 239, 245, 248
- Dess, *see* Dease
- Deval, 153, 198
- Devonshire, Duke of, *see* Cavendish
- devshirme, 32, 55, 247
- diary, ix–xiii, 129–94
- Dickinson, 7, 122
- divan, 41, 55, 247, 250
- doctor, *see* physician
- Dolmabache, Dollmabash, 153–4, 166, 246–7
- Dolfín, Daniele, 198
- Dominico, 162, 198
- Dorrell, 168, 198
- Dover, Dr, 173–4, 198, 233

INDEX

- dragoman/druggerman/interpreter, 12, 18, 22, 35, 37–42, 50, 62–5, 70, 73, 75–7, 79, 85, 87–9, 95–8, 100–2, 108–10, 114, 118, 122, 127, 147, 156–7, 160, 197, 198–9, 202–5, 214, 233, 247; of the Porte, 35, 37–42, 50, 63–5, 75, 79, 89, 101–2, 156, 160, 199, 214
 dress, *see* clothing
 Drummond, Andrew/Drummond's Bank, 4–5, 9, 71, 121, 198
 Drummond, William, of Edinburgh, 5, 7–8
 Dupplin House, 1, 3, 5–6, 9
 Dupplin, Lord, *see* Hay, George Henry and/or Hay, Thomas
 Dutch ambassador, *see* Calkoen

 Ekarr, Ecarr, 161, 198
 Elliot, 151, 198
 embassy (buildings), 20–1, 23, 32, 69, 73, 101, 104, 115, 132, 137–40, 156, 158
 Emo, Angelo, 64, 75, 159, 196–9
 Entertainment, 33, 42, 49–50, 60, 73–4, 77, 101–2, 109, 113–15, 117, 122, 128, 130–1, 143, 150, 154, 157–63, 165, 168, 198, 214, 232
 Esperance(s), 141, 146, 153, 198
 Eugene, Prince, 47, 147, 196, 198
 Excursions, 26–9, 60, 91, 130, 134–6, 140–1, 144–7, 151, 153, 171, 250

 Fanshaw, 168, 199
 Fatwa, 55, 247
 Fawkener, Edward, 199
 Fawkener, Sir Everard, 55, 59, 63, 72, 75, 78, 82, 90, 112–20, 127–8, 132, 140, 167–8, 186, 199, 206, 214, 234, 244
 Fawkener, Kenelm, 199
 fires, 20, 22–5, 32, 69, 120, 131, 138, 156, 236; fire engine, 24
 fishing, 26, 91, 130, 134, 137, 144–5
 Fleury, Cardinal, 81, 89, 92, 112, 199, 242
 Foley, Lord, 2
 food and drink (specified, consumption of), 23, 74, 141, 153–4, 165, 168
 food and drink (specified, supply/purchase of), 16, 23, 62, 131, 139–44, 148–50, 215–16

 footman, 33, 38, 129, 132–3, 138–9, 148, 201, 240
 fountains, 20–1, 26, 85, 97, 141, 143–4, 147, 171
 France, policy and ambassador, *see* Renaud
 Franceway, 151, 199
 Franks, 16–19, 22–3, 25–6, 28, 34, 38, 40, 43, 54, 56, 58–9, 62, 64, 75, 79, 85, 95, 247
 Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony, 82, 111, 199
 French policy and ambassador, *see* Renaud
 funerals, xi, 32, 147–8, 154, 166, 168, 191, 208
 furniture/furnishing, 20–1, 38, 59, 69, 94, 121, 133, 138

 Galata/Galletta, 18–19, 22–3, 28, 34, 43, 142, 146, 149, 152–4, 166–7, 247
 Gallio, 169, 199
 gardens, 3, 13, 18, 26, 59, 130, 138, 141, 143–4, 170, 247
 Gendry meadow, 134–6, 145, 153, 247
 Genings, *see* Jennings
 Gerard of Bromley, Lady, 34, 164
 German policy and representative, *see* Thalmann
 German, J., 19, 138, 141–2, 154, 199
 Ghika, *see* Dragoman of the Porte
 giaour, 18, 247
 gifts, *see* presents
 Gilles of Albi, Pierre, 27, 195, 241
giovane di lingua, 38, 64, 73, 77, 145, 147–8, 196, 207, 233, 248
 Golden Horn, 18–19, 26, 60, 226
 gout, xii, 171–6, 192
 Grand Vizier, 13, 22–3, 26–7, 36–42, 44, 47, 49–64, 66, 68, 75, 80–2, 84, 87–90, 92, 97, 99, 106, 109, 112, 116–17, 125–6, 156, 196, 198, 201, 206–7, 248
 Grand Signor, Grand Senior, 13, 23, 26, 28–9, 38, 40–2, 49, 52–3, 57, 59, 61–2, 66, 79, 81, 90–1, 94, 97, 103, 111, 113, 117, 156, 164, 202, 246, 248
 gratuity (for ambassadors), *see* allowance
 Great Bayram, 28, 31, 75–6, 248, 250
 Greeks, xi, 14, 16–19, 21–2, 24, 33–4, 63–4, 70, 77, 87, 97, 145, 160, 191

INDEX

- Griblin(g), 170, 199
groom to the chamber, ix, 138, 210
- Hack, Captain, 165, 199
Halil, Patrona, 56, 125, 199
Hamshire, Captain, 152, 166, 199
Hanger, William, 52–3, 71, 76, 114, 143, 149, 155, 162, 165, 199
Harley, Abigail, aunt of Lady Abigail Hay, 3, 5, 7, 199–200
Harley, Robert, 1st Earl of Oxford, 1–4, 200, 238, 241, 243
Harley, Edward, 2nd Earl of Oxford, 2–7, 122–3, 200, 238, 243
Harrington, Lord, *see* Stanhope, William
Hay, Abigail, née Harley, Lady Dupplin, Countess of Kinnoull 1–8, 124, 200
Hay, George Henry, 8th Earl of Kinnoull, 1–15, 36–132
Hay of Cromlix, John, 2, 5–6, 200
Hay, Thomas, 1–2, 7, 11, 33, 37–9, 41, 117, 119, 122–4, 200
Hay-Drummond, Robert, 2, 7, 124, 200
Health, 21–5, 29–30, 32, 61, 66, 101, 113, 170–7, 192
Hill, Aaron, 17, 239
Hillars, 142, 146, 152–3, 166, 200
Hippis, 163, 168, 200
Hogg, Captain, 167, 200
Holland, policy and ambassador of, *see* Calcoen
Horse, 12, 22–5, 27–8, 37–8, 40–2, 48, 51–2, 72, 78, 97, 118–21, 150, 159, 171, 198, 246
House of Felicity, 34, 55, 248
Humpheries, 148–50, 153, 155, 163, 168, 200
- Imperial (as of Austrian Empire), *see* Thalmann
inflation, 59, 71
inoculation, 29–30
Ishmael pasha, Grand Vizier, 81, 196, 201
Islam, 30–2, 55, 125, 196, 239–42, 247–50
- Jackoos, 19, 142, 151, 154, 254
Jacobites, 2, 5–7, 46, 68, 89, 93, 112, 126, 183, 199–200, 227, 230, 239–42
- Janissary/janesary 18, 23, 28–9, 33–4, 37, 40, 42, 55, 58, 61, 73, 129, 134, 146, 248
Jennings, James, 52–3, 76, 116, 162, 170, 197, 201
Jews/Judaism, 16–8, 30–2, 65, 70
Jones, 32, 149, 153, 168, 201
Joppa, 34, 137, 168, 248
- kahya, *see* chehaia
Kaplan Pasha, Captin Bashaw 35, 55, 156, 169, 248
Kinnoull, Earl of, *see* Hay, George
Kiosk/keesk/chiosk, 13, 26, 37, 77, 91, 103, 130, 137, 156, 171, 248
Kisla (Kizla) Aga, 55, 75, 248
- Lacount, 152, 201
Laister, 26, 163, 201
lale devri, *see* tulip
Layer conspiracy, 5
Leaster, *see* Laister
Lee, 162, 167, 202
Leszczynski, Stanislaus, 59, 82–6, 89, 93, 111, 201
Levant Company, v, x–xi, 8–9, 12–14, 18, 23, 26, 34, 36, 38–40, 44–5, 49, 54, 59, 62, 64–78, 81, 85, 94–7, 113–14, 116, 119, 122, 126, 128, 130–1, 134, 137, 154–5, 158, 162, 164–6, 177–8, 180, 190, 192, 196, 198–204, 206–7, 214, 238, 242, 246–7
Levit, 162, 202
Library, xi, 73, 129, 177, 180, 190
Lisbon, 10–11, 14
Lisle, Captain, 77, 162–3, 201
Lisle family, merchants, 27, 50, 53–4, 96, 109, 114, 136, 155, 162–3, 167–8, 201
Little Bayram, 28, 31, 75, 246, 248
Livorno/Leghorn, 11, 107, 216, 248
Long, Captain, 167–8, 201
Louis XV, King of France, 46, 59, 82, 112, 160, 201–22, 242
Lupart, Pierre, 76, 202
Lynwood, 144, 148, 150, 202
- Mahmud I, Sultan (*see also* Grand Signor), 56, 60–1, 81, 202

INDEX

- Mahommedan, Mahometan, *see* Islam
 Madam/M–m, *see* Sabreau, Judith
 Mar, Earl of, 2, 199
 Marchant, Jacob, 16, 202
 Marchant, Captain, 153, 167, 202
 master of the horse, 12, 37, 48, 97, 150, 159, 198
 Matth, 26, 32, 102, 142–3, 148–53, 202
 Maydwell, 76, 155, 162, 202
 Medley, Samuel, writer of the diary (1667–), ix–xiii, 155–94, 209–10
 Medley, Samuel, The Revd, (1738–99), xii, 211–12
 Medley, Samuel, of Chatham (1769–1857), xii, 212
 Medley, Samuel, of Aleppo, 202
 Medley, Sarah, xiii, 213
medrese, 55, 248
 merchants, 8–9, 12, 14, 16–18, 23, 26, 34, 36–7, 40–1, 43, 45, 49, 50, 52–4, 59, 61, 67–78, 91, 96, 115, 125–6, 131, 134, 143–4, 153–8, 160, 162–3, 165, 167–8, 170, 192, 195–206, 214
 Monier, Louis, 27, 77, 92, 97–110, 122, 127, 136–7, 156, 160, 202
 Mor(i)agy, Colonel, 26, 163, 202
 Moslem, *see* Islam
 mufti, 55, 247–9
 Murray of Ochertyre, Sir Patrick, 1, 5–6, 8–9, 122, 203
 Muscovite policy and ambassador, *see* Neplyuev
 Muslim, *see* Islam
 Mustafa II, 55, 57, 59, 203
 Nadir Shah, *see* Tamas Kuli Khan
 Neplyuev, Ivan, 42–48, 53, 57–64, 81–4, 86–90, 94, 98, 100–3, 106–14, 126, 157, 203
 Newcastle, Lord, *see* Pelham–Holles, Thomas
 O’Hara, James, Lord Tyrawley, 10, 11, 14
 Osborn, Captain, 117–18, 203
 Osman Pasha, *see* Topal Osman
 Ostermann, 82, 89, 110, 203
 Ottoman/Turkish Empire, Turkey, and policy of, 13, 16, 22, 26, 32, 34–5, 42–8, 50, 52–68, 70–1, 73–6, 78–84, 87–90, 92–5, 97, 100–3, 106, 108–9, 111–12, 118, 120, 125–6, 128, 156–8, 160–1, 164, 196–7
 Ottoman/Turkish customs and lifestyle, 17–21, 24, 28–32, 33, 35–6
 Ovid’s tower, 26, 135, 248
 Oxford, Earl of, *see* Harley
padishah, 45, 54, 56, 250
 Passarowitz, Treaty of 45, 83
 Patrona Halil, *see* Halil, Patrona
 pay (of ambassadors), *see* allowance; for Medley, 131, 215
 Payne, The Reverend Thomas 26, 73, 76–7, 115, 132, 134, 143–5, 148–9, 154–5, 159, 162–3, 165, 167, 170, 178, 180, 190, 192, 196, 200–2
 Pelham–Holles, Thomas, 1st Duke of Newcastle, 8–9, 11, 13, 33, 39–40, 42, 46–9, 55, 60, 62–3, 65–6, 69, 71–2, 75, 79, 80–91, 96–9, 106–8, 110–11, 114, 116, 118–21, 124, 127, 157, 161, 164, 168, 203
 Pemberton, 143, 155, 162, 192, 203
 Pera, Pears, 18–20, 22–3, 25, 27–8, 33, 39–40, 43, 50, 64–5, 85, 90, 98, 101, 118, 130–1, 133–7, 139–41, 143–5, 148, 150–1, 153, 158, 160, 171, 184
 Perry, Dr, 155, 203, 241
 pest, *see* plague
 Peter the Great, Emperor of Russia, 42, 44, 90, 197, 203
 Petrie, Captain, 49–54, 62, 76–7, 134, 137, 165, 168, 203
 Phill, 165, 168, 204
 Phi(li)ps, 163
 physician, 154, 173–4, 233
 pilau, 40, 55, 249
 pillar, 27, 166, 249
 Pisani, Antonio, 50–1, 85, 95–8, 102, 106, 109, 114, 118, 122, 127, 156, 204
 plague, 22, 25, 30, 32, 61, 66, 101, 170, 192, 249
 Polish Succession, War of, 59, 81–90, 92, 126–7, 169
 Pontefract, ix, xiii, 2, 190, 210–12
 Pope, Alexander, 3, 14, 181, 186

INDEX

- popery, xi, 32–3, 77, 148, 179–80, 182, 186, 191
 Porter, Mr, 153, 204
 Porter, Sir James, 63
 presents, 36, 39, 42, 59, 62, 65, 68, 74–6, 79, 81, 97, 102, 118, 168
 Pretender, the 2, 5, 6, 199–200
 printing (in Turkey), 58, 60
 Pruth, Treaty of, 45, 87
 Pullinger, Arthur, 203–4
 Purrier, 155, 161, 163, 204

 Quartastrada/quarter strad, 111, 115, 167, 249
 Quincy, Dr, 174, 204

ragionateria, 75, 249
 Ragusa/Ragousia/Dubrovnik, 95, 161, 203, 249
 Rakoczi, Prince Francis, 47–8, 163–4, 204
 Rasoes/Raza/Razoo, the French baker, 143, 195, 204
reis effendi (Secretary of State), 39, 51, 55, 64–5, 75–6, 249
 Remotee, Captain, 169, 204
 Renaud, Louis Sauveur, Marquis de Villeneuve, French policy and ambassador, 26, 33–5, 37–8, 43, 45–7, 51–3, 59–63, 65, 68, 71–2, 74–7, 81–94, 96, 98–102, 105, 107–12, 118, 120, 126, 128, 135–6, 146–7, 157, 160, 162–4, 196, 198–9, 204
 riding, 25, 27, 40, 91, 134–6, 141, 149, 154, 158, 163, 171
 Rigo, 161, 204
 Riso, Giacomo, 87–9, 101–2, 110, 113, 126, 204
 Robi(n)son, Bob(b)y, 19, 150, 153–5, 172, 204
 Robinson, Thomas, 22, 47–8, 65–7, 84–7, 110, 112–14, 146, 166, 204
 Rondeau, Claudius 93, 99–100, 110, 112–13, 118–19, 199, 204
 Rose, Bart, 152, 169, 205
 Rowndell, Roundell, 170–1, 205
 Ruddy, 141, 153, 205
 Russian policy and ambassador, *see* Neplyuev

 Rycaut, 17, 56, 241

 Sa'adabad/Sattabat, 26, 28, 60, 91, 114, 249
 Sabreau, Judith, 15, 33, 85, 101, 104–5, 115, 124, 128, 130–7, 142, 144–6, 156, 159, 161, 165, 168, 175, 205
 safety, 21–5, 36, 52, 103, 175
 salary (of ambassadors), *see* allowance
 Sandys, Mrs Ann née Sabreau, 21, 34, 104, 124, 133–7, 156, 168, 205
 Sandys, William, 9–13, 21, 37, 72, 77, 97, 104–5, 134, 137, 151, 196, 205
 Santa Lucia/St Lucy, 135, 249
 Santa Sophia/Aya Sofya, 27–8, 34, 44, 91, 136, 249
 Saussure, César de, 9–13, 16, 29, 63, 92, 105, 122, 127, 163, 198, 205
 Savage, 34, 141, 143, 163, 166, 192, 205
scrivan effendi, 73, 249
 Scutari/Scutary/Uskudar, 23, 61, 249
 seale, 37, 167, 249
 security, *see* safety
 Seraglio/Serallio, 13, 18, 23–4, 27, 34, 40, 51, 54–5, 59, 61, 79, 166, 249
 servants, ix, xi, 9–11, 14, 28, 30, 33–4, 55, 70, 72, 74, 94, 96, 98, 115–16, 120, 132–3, 138, 140, 168, 170, 210, 216
 Sesan, 153, 166, 171, 205
 Sharia law, 55, 249
 sheik ul Islam, *see* mufti
 sherap house, 18–19, 142–3, 151–2, 154, 249–50, 254
 Shermetts, 153, 172, 205
 Sierakowski, Count, 63, 158, 205
sipahi, 55, 249
 smallpox, 3, 29–30
 Smith, Dr, 19, 32, 142–3, 153–5, 165, 205
 Smyrna, Izmir, 47, 68, 76, 90, 106–7, 165, 208, 250
 Soseer, *see* Saussure
 South Sea Company, 3–6
 spassa, *see* excursion
 Stambol(l), *see* Constantinople
 Stanhope, William, The Rt Hon. Lord Harrington, 66, 80, 93, 99, 110, 112–13, 118, 166, 205

INDEX

- Stadnicki/Stani(n)sky/Kin(ins)ky, 26,
 82–3, 85–6, 94, 107, 109–11, 127, 130,
 134–7, 144, 159–60, 163, 197, 206
 Stanislaus, *see* Leszcynski
 Stanton, 143, 163, 206
 Stanyan, Abraham, 9, 12, 14, 33, 36–40,
 48, 68–9, 71, 75, 95–6, 103, 131, 206
 States General, policy and ambassador of,
 see Calkoen
 steward, 7, 9, 14, 33–4, 38, 51, 104,
 121–2, 129, 131–3, 137–45, 149–52,
 155
 Stratford, William, 2, 4–8, 206
 Suckling, 165, 206
 Swedish policy and representatives, 26, 28,
 43, 63, 88, 90–5, 102, 104, 110, 118,
 120–1, 127, 130, 134–7, 143–4, 149,
 153, 156, 163, 175, 197, 201, 207
 Sweet Waters, 26, 60

 Tamas Kuli Khan, Nadir Shah, 60–1,
 79–80, 206
 Tartars, 80, 89, 92, 112, 173
 Tavern/taverem, *see* sherap house
tekke, *see* dervishes
 Thalmann, Baron Leopold, and family;
 Imperial policy 16, 26, 34, 37, 42–9,
 52–3, 60–1, 63, 65–6, 71, 74, 80–7,
 89–90, 94, 98–9, 100–4, 108–11,
 113–15, 120, 122, 126, 128, 136, 157,
 160, 163, 206
 The(e)odos(e)/Theodore/Thodosos, Dr,
 and spouse, 26, 163, 206
 Timms, Captain, 151, 153, 167, 206
 Timone, Angelo, 148, 206
 Tobin, 33, 168, 206
 Tomazo, 140, 206, 215
 Topal Osman, Grand Vizier, 49–50, 52–3,
 62, 80, 196, 207
 Topena, 28, 142, 146, 149, 151–4, 166,
 250
Torrington, HMS, 9–14, 39–40, 152, 163,
 219
 trade, 16–17, 23, 43, 45, 49, 58, 67–78,
 81, 90–1, 94, 125–6, 139, 159, 161
 Trecoo/Trecgoe, 161–3, 207

 tulip/tulip period, 39, 59–60, 125, 241,
 248
 Turkish, *see* Ottoman
 Tyrawley, Lord, *see* O'Hara, James

 ulema, 55, 250
 Utrecht, Treaty of, 2, 46

 valet, 138–9, 145
 Valide, Vallade, 101, 250
 Vanmour, Jean Baptiste 21, 27, 160, 207
 Venice, Venetian, *see* bailo
 Veshnyakov/Wieschniakov/Vis(n)coff, 48,
 57, 101, 107, 109, 111–14, 157, 207
 Vienna, Treaty of, 81, 86
 village, 'the other', 26, 85, 136–7, 141–2,
 144–5
 Villars, Marshal, 86, 207
 Villeneuve, Marquis de, *see* Renaud
 Vincent, Captain, 9–13, 39, 41
 Vizier, *see* Grand Vizier
 von Höpken, Carl Fredrik, *see* Swedish

 Waldegrave, James, 1st Earl Waldegrave,
 98, 208
 Wallace (Peter, William and 'Mr'), 77,
 143, 147–9, 150, 152, 207
 Walpole, Horace, 8, 86, 99, 112, 116, 119,
 207–8
 Walpole, Sir Robert, 7–8, 14, 46, 81–2,
 93, 98, 112, 116–17, 119, 121, 123,
 126, 208
 weather, x, 10, 12, 21–5, 28, 39, 76, 109,
 113, 115, 132–3, 135–6, 142, 148–50,
 152, 155–6, 159, 161–2, 165, 169,
 172
 William (Captain Petrie's ship), 49, 66,
 165, 204, 207
 wine, 18–21, 23, 70, 74, 102, 118, 127,
 131–2, 139, 142–3, 146, 158, 173, 201,
 249
 Wortley Montagu, Edward, 72, 208
 Wortley Montagu, Lady Mary, 17–19, 21,
 29, 32–4, 208

 Zy, Baron, 26, 50, 77, 130, 163, 201, 208

